بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله القائل قَالَ تَعَالَى: ﴿ وَأَنَّ هَٰذَا صِرَٰطِي مُسْتَقِيمًا فَٱتَّبِعُوهُ ۖ وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا۟ ٱلسُّبُلَ فَتَفَرَّقَ بِكُمْ عَن سَبِيلِهِۦ ۚ ذَٰلِكُمْ وَصَّىٰكُم بِهِۦ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ ﴿١٥٣﴾ ﴾ الأنعام: ١٥٣

والصلاة والسلام على من حذر أمَّته فقال ((**دعاة على أبواب جهنم من أجابهم إليها قذفوه**)) جزء من حديث حذيفة في الصحيحين.

إن التحذير من رؤوس أهل البدع ومن بدعهم لهو من أعظم الجهاد فقد قال شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية رحمه الله تعالى في الفتاوى ٤/١٣ :

(فالراد على أهل البدع مجاهد حتى كان يحي بن يحي يقول : الذب عن السنة أفضل من الجهاد...) أ.هـ

وقال أيضا ٢٨ / ٢٣١ – ٢٣٢ :– ((مثل أئمة البدع من أهل المقالات المخالفة للكتاب والسنة فإن بيان حالهم وتحذير الأمة منهم واجب باتفاق المسلمين حتى قيل لأحمد بن حنبل ، الرجل يصوم ويصلي ويعتكف أحب إليك أو يتكلم في أهل البدع ؟ فقال : إذا قام وصلى واعتكف فإنما هو لنفسه وإذا تكلم في أهل البدع فإنما هو للمسلمين هذا أفضل ، فبين أن نفع هذا عام للمسلمين في دينهم من جنس الجهاد في سبيل الله إذ تطهير سبيل الله ودينه ومنهاجه وشرعته ودفع بغي هؤلاء وعدوانهم على ذلك واجب على الكفاية باتفاق المسلمين ولولا من يقيمه الله لدفع ضرر هؤلاء لفسد الدين وكان فساده أعظم من فساد استيلاء العدو من أهل الحرب فإن هؤلاء اذا استولوا لم يفسدوا القلوب وما فيها من الدين تبعاً وأما أولئك فهم يفسدون القلوب ابتداء).

وقال ابن القيم في مدارج السالكين ٣٧٢ / ١ : (واشتد نكير السلف والأئمة لها – البدعة– وصاحوا بأهلها من أقطار الأرض ، وحذروا من فتنتهم أشد التحذير ، بالغوا في ذلك ما لم يبالغوا مثله في إنكار الفواحش والظلم والعدوان ، إذ مضرة البدع وهدمها للدين ومنافاتها له أشد).

-

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

All praise is due to Allah, who said: "And indeed, this is My straight path, so follow it; and do not follow other paths, for they will separate you from His path. This has been ordained for you that you may become righteous." (Al-An'am: 153)

And may peace and blessings be upon the one who warned his nation, saying: "There will be callers at the gates of Hell; whoever responds to them will be thrown into it." This is part of a hadith narrated by Hudhayfah in the two Sahihs.

Indeed, warning against the leaders of innovation and their innovations is one of the greatest forms of jihad. Sheikh Al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said in his fatwas (4/13):

"The one who refutes the people of innovation is a mujahid, to the extent that Yahya ibn Yahya said: Defending the Sunnah is better than jihad..."

He also said (28/231-232): "The likes of the leaders of innovation, who hold views contrary to the Book and the Sunnah, it is obligatory by consensus among Muslims to clarify their condition and warn the nation against them. It was said to Ahmad ibn Hanbal: Which is better, a man who fasts, prays, and performs i'tikaf, or one who speaks about the people of innovation? He said: If he stands, prays, and performs i'tikaf, it is for himself; but if he speaks about the people of innovation, it is for the Muslims, and this is better. He clarified that the benefit of this is general for the Muslims in their religion, akin to jihad in the way of Allah, as purifying the path of Allah, His religion, His methodology, and His legislation, and repelling the aggression of these innovators is an obligation of communal responsibility by consensus among Muslims. Were it not for those whom Allah appoints to repel the harm of these people, the religion would be corrupted, and its corruption would be greater than the corruption caused by the enemy's conquest. For when these enemies conquer, they do not corrupt the hearts and what is in them of religion; rather, those innovators corrupt the hearts from the outset."

Ibn Al-Qayyim said in "Madarij Al-Salikin" (372/1): "The early generations and the imams strongly condemned innovation and warned against its people from all corners of the earth, warning against their fitnah with the utmost caution. They exaggerated in this to a degree that they did not exaggerate in denouncing immorality, oppression, and aggression, for the harm of innovations and their destruction of the religion, and their contradiction to it, is more severe."

-
Imam Muslim, may Allah have mercy on him, said in the

قال الإمام مسلم رحمه الله في مقدمة صحيحه [بَاب الْكَشْفِ عَنْ مَعَايِبِ رُوَاةِ الْحَدِيثِ وَنَقَلَةِ الأَخْبَارِ وَقَوْلِ الأَئِمَّةِ فِى ذَلِكَ]: ((وقال محمد سمعتُ عليَّ بن شَقيق يقول: سمعتُ عبدالله بن المبارك يقول على رؤوس الناس: "دَعُوا حَدِيثَ عَمْرِو بْنِ ثَابِتٍ فَإِنَّهُ كَانَ يَسُبُّ السَّلَفَ")).

بعض أصول المعتزلة:-

وكان من أوائل الفرق المبتدعة التي خرجت في هذه الأمه وورثت لها وارث المعتزلة وقد خرجت هذه الفرقة في أواخر العصر الأموي وازدهرت في العصر العباسي وقد اعتمدت على العقل المجرد في فهم العقيدة .

فكان من أصولهم الباطلة التي أصلوها على فهمهم الفاسد التوحيد والعدل فالتوحيد عندهم نفي الصفات والقول بأن القرآن مخلوق .

نتيجة ما بنوه : -

فمن لم يعتقد ذلك المعتقد فهو كافر ومن لم يكفر هذا الكافر أو شك في كفره فهو كافر..

وكما يقال :إن لكل قوم وارث فقد خرجت فرقةٌ ضالة **تكفر من عذر من وقع في الشرك المتسب للإسلام جاهلاً وسماه مسلماً قبل إقامة الحجة وإزالة الشبهة** ، منطلقين من قاعدة ((**من لم يكفر المشركين أو شك في كفرهم او صحح مذهبهم كفر**)).

وهذه القاعدة صحيحة لا شك فيها وأنها حق لكن على فهم أئمة السلف ومن تبعهم كابن تيمية وتلميذه ابن القيم وأئمة الدعوة لا على فهم العاذرية الحازمية.

وقد كان أبو مريم الكويتي وضياء القدسي وغيرهما قد تبنوا هذا المعتقد ودعوا الناس اليه بَيْد أن دعوتهم لم يكن لها رواج وانتشار حتى خرج الشيخ/ أحمد بن عمر الحازمي فتلقف هذا المعتقد وبدأ يؤصل له ويدعو الناس إليه ومن لم يعتقد هذا المعتقد أو شك فيه

introduction to his Sahih [Chapter on Exposing the Flaws of the Narrators of Hadith and the Reporters of News and the Sayings of the Imams on This Matter]: "Muhammad said: I heard Ali ibn Shaqiq say: I heard Abdullah ibn al-Mubarak say in front of the people: 'Leave the narration of Amr ibn Thabit, for he used to insult the predecessors.'"

Some Principles of the Mu'tazila
They were among the earliest heretical sects that emerged in this nation and inherited the legacy of the Mu'tazila. This sect emerged in the late Umayyad period and flourished in the Abbasid era, relying on pure reason in understanding doctrine.

Among their false principles, which they established based on their corrupt understanding, were Tawhid (the oneness of God) and justice. For them, Tawhid meant negating attributes and claiming that the Quran is created.

Kafir (disbeliever)...

As a result of what they built:
Whoever does not believe in that belief is a disbeliever, and whoever does not declare this disbeliever to be a disbeliever or doubts his disbelief is also a disbeliever.

As it is said: "Every group has its inheritor," a misguided sect emerged that declares as disbelievers those who excuse someone who falls into polytheism while claiming to be a Muslim out of ignorance, and they call him a Muslim before establishing proof and removing doubt, based on the principle: "Whoever does not declare polytheists to be disbelievers or doubts their disbelief or validates their doctrine is a disbeliever."

This principle is undoubtedly correct and true, but it must be understood according to the understanding of the Salaf and those who followed them, such as Ibn Taymiyyah, his student Ibn al-Qayyim, and the Imams of the Da'wah, not according to the understanding of the 'Azhariyyah al-Hazmiyyah.

Omar
Abu Maryam al-Kuwaiti, Diya al-Qudsi, and others adopted this belief and called people to it, but their call did not gain traction and spread until Sheikh Ahmad ibn al-Hazmi emerged, who embraced this belief and began to establish it and call people to it. Whoever does not believe in this belief or doubts it…

وكما يقال :إن لكل قوم وارث فقد خرجت فرقةٌ ضالة **تكفر من عذر من وقع في الشرك المنتسب للإسلام جاهلاً وسماه مسلماً قبل إقامة الحجة وإزالة الشبهة** ، منطلقين من قاعدة ((**من لم يكفر المشركين أو شك في كفرهم او صحح مذهبهم كفر**)).

وهذه القاعدة صحيحة لا شك فيها وأنها حق لكن على فهم أئمة السلف ومن تبعهم كابن تيمية وتلميذه ابن القيم وأئمة الدعوة لا على فهم العاذرية الحازمية.

وقد كان أبو مريم الكويتي وضياء القدسي وغيرهما قد تبنوا هذا المعتقد ودعوا الناس اليه بَيْد أن دعوتهم لم يكن لها رواج وانتشار حتى خرج الشيخ/ أحمد بن عمر الحازمي فتلقف هذا المعتقد وبدأ يؤصل له ويدعو الناس إليه ومن لم يعتقد هذا المعتقد أو شك فيه

-

فهو كافر بل حتى من لم يكفر الأول فهو أيضاً كافر فحريٌّ أن تنسب هذه الفرقة اليه وإن لم يكن هو مؤسسها أو منشؤها.

فالفرقة الجهمية نُسبت الى جهم بن صفوان علماً بأن من أنشأ هذا الفرقة وابتدع هذه البدعة هو شيخه الجعد بن درهم وبما أن جهم هو الذي تولى نشرها ودعا الناس اليها وأصّل لها فُتن به أقوام فمن وسم بدعتهم **"بالعاذرية"** تسمية لتكفيرهم العاذر قبل قيام الحجه فقد أصاب ومن وسم هذه البدعة ب(**العاذرية الحازمية**) أو (**الحازمية**) نسبة لمن أصّل لها وزينها فقد أصاب وهو أولى.

والشيخ الحازمي قد مر في مرحلته العلمية بأطوار ومراحل فكان بادئ أمره جامياً جلداً ثم تحول الى الحدادية **"ومن أصول الحدادية تكفير العاذر"** ثم انتقل (**بحدادية تحت غطاء السلفية ليروج بدعته**) إلى السلفية فهو ينتقل من بدعة إلى بدعة وما تدري ما هي مرحلته ومحطته القادمة ماذا سيكون حاله نسأل الله له الهداية.

وقد ذم السلف وحذروا من كان هذا حاله فقد ذكر ابن بطة في الإبانة الكبرى " أنَّ ابا مسعود الأنصاري قال لحذيفة -: أوصني قال :- إن الضلالة حق الضلالة أن تعرف ما كنت تنكر وتنكر ماكنت تعرف وإياك والتلون في دين الله فإن دين الله واحد " .

-

As it is said: "Every group has its inheritor," a misguided sect has emerged that declares as disbelievers those who excuse someone who falls into polytheism while claiming to be a Muslim out of ignorance, and they call him a Muslim before establishing proof and removing doubt, based on the principle: "Whoever does not declare polytheists to be disbelievers or doubts their disbelief or validates their doctrine is a disbeliever."

This principle is undoubtedly correct and true, but it must be understood according to the understanding of the Imams of the Salaf and those who followed them, such as Ibn Taymiyyah, his student Ibn al-Qayyim, and the Imams of the Da'wah, not according to the understanding of the 'Azhariyyah al-Hazmiyyah.

Abu Maryam al-Kuwaiti, Diya al-Qudsi, and others adopted this belief and called people to it, but their call did not gain traction and spread until Sheikh Ahmad ibn Umar al-Hazmi emerged, who embraced this belief and began to establish it and call people to it. Whoever does not believe in this belief or doubts it is a disbeliever; indeed, even those who do not declare the first one to be a disbeliever are also disbelievers. It is fitting to attribute this sect to him, even if he was not its founder or originator.

The Jahmiyyah sect was attributed to Jahm ibn Safwan, knowing that the one who established this sect and innovated this innovation was his teacher, al-Ja'd ibn Dirham. Since Jahm was the one who took on the task of spreading it, calling people to it, and establishing it, he led many astray. Those who labeled their innovation as "the 'Azhariyyah" did so to denote their declaring the excuser to be a disbeliever before the establishment of this innovation as "the 'Azhariyyah al-Hazmiyyah" or simply "the Hazmiyyah," in reference to whom the proof is attributed.

The Sheikh al-Hazmi went through various stages in his scholarly journey. Initially, he was a staunch Jam'i, then he shifted to the Haddadiyyah, and among the principles of the Haddadiyyah is the declaration of the "excuser" as a disbeliever. He then transitioned (with his Haddadiyyah under the guise of Salafiyyah) to promote his innovation (to Salafiyyah), moving from one innovation to another, and one cannot predict what his next stage or condition will be. We ask Allah for his guidance.

The Salaf condemned and warned against those who are in such a state. Ibn Batta mentioned in "Al-Ibanah al-Kubra" that Abu Mas'ud al-Ansari said to Hudhayfah: "Advise me." He said: "The true misguidance is to know what you used to deny and to deny what you used to know. Beware of changing colors in the religion of Allah, for the religion of Allah is one."

-

-

قَالَ الْقَاضِي: سُئِلَ الْإِمَامُ أَحْمَدُ - رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ - عَنْ مَا رُوِيَ عَنْ النَّبِيِّ ﷺ : «**أَنَّ اللهَ احْتَجَرَ التَّوْبَةَ عَنْ كُلِّ صَاحِبِ بِدْعَةٍ**» وَحَجْرُ التَّوْبَةِ إيش مَعْنَاهُ؟ قَالَ أَحْمَدُ: لَا يُوَفَّقُ، وَلَا يُيَسَّرُ صَاحِبُ بِدْعَةٍ.

وَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ ﷺ لَمَّا قَرَأَ هَذِهِ الْآيَةَ: {إِنَّ الَّذِينَ فَرَّقُوا دِينَهُمْ وَكَانُوا شِيَعًا لَسْتَ مِنْهُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ}..

قَالَ شَيْخُ الْإِسْلَامِ ابْنُ تَيْمِيَّةَ - قَدَّسَ اللهُ رُوحَهُ : لِأَنَّ اعْتِقَادَهُ كَذَلِكَ يَدْعُوهُ إِلَى أَلَّا يَنْظُرَ نَظَرًا تَامًّا إِلَى دَلِيلِ خِلَافِهِ، فَلَا يَعْرِفُ الْحَقَّ، وَلِهَذَا قَالَ السَّلَفُ: إِنَّ الْبِدْعَةَ أَحَبُّ إِلَى إِبْلِيسَ مِنْ الْمَعْصِيَةِ وَقَالَ أَبُو أَيُّوبَ السِّجِسْتَانِيُّ وَغَيْرُهُ: إِنَّ الْمُبْتَدِعَ لَا يَرْجِعُ

وَقَالَ أَيْضًا: التَّوْبَةُ مِنْ الِاعْتِقَادِ الَّذِي كَثُرَ مُلَازَمَةُ صَاحِبِهِ لَهُ، وَمَعْرِفَتُهُ بِحُجَجِهِ يَحْتَاجُ إِلَى مَا يُقَابِلُ ذَلِكَ مِنْ الْمَعْرِفَةِ، وَالْعِلْمِ، وَالْأَدِلَّةِ.

وسلفنا الصالح كلامهم حق في أن صاحب البدعة صعب رجوعه للحق لظنه أنه يحسن صنعا ، فالشيخ الحازمي لم يترك بدعته "**الحدادية**" في تكفيره للعاذر فلم يزل على بدعته هو وشيخه محمود الحداد .

قال الشاطبي في الاعتصام: إذ لا يبعد أن يتوب عما رأى، ويرجع إلى الحق، كما نقل عن عبد الله بن الحسن العنبري، وما نقلوه في مناظرة ابن عباس الحرورية الخارجين على علي - رضي الله عنه - وفي مناظرة عمر بن عبد العزيز لبعضهم، **ولكن الغالب في الواقع الإصرار.**

-

Ibrahim also mentioned: "They used to dislike changing colors in religion." In a narration from Abu Ibrahim, he said: "They viewed changing colors in religion as a sign of doubt in the hearts regarding Allah." Malik said: "The serious disease is the constant shifting in religion." He also said: "If you were not playing, do not play in your religion." Umar ibn Abdul Aziz said: "Whoever makes his religion a target for disputes will find himself constantly shifting."

The judge said: Imam Ahmad, may Allah be pleased with him, was asked about what was narrated from the Prophet (peace be upon him): "Indeed, Allah has withheld repentance from every innovator." What does withholding repentance mean? Ahmad said: "He will not be granted success, nor will the innovator find ease." The Prophet (peace be upon him) recited this verse: {Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects, you have nothing to do with them...}

Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah sanctify his soul, said: "Because such a belief leads him not to look thoroughly at the evidence against it, he will not recognize the truth." The Salaf said: "Innovation is more beloved to Iblis than disobedience." Abu Ayyub al-Sijistani and others said: "The innovator does not return." He also said: "Repentance from a belief that its adherent frequently clings to requires knowledge and evidence that counters it."

Our righteous predecessors spoke the truth when they said that it is difficult for the innovator to return to the truth because he thinks he is doing well. Sheikh al-Hazmi did not abandon his innovation, the "Haddadiyyah," in declaring the excuser a disbeliever; he remained steadfast in his innovation along with his teacher, Mahmoud al-Haddad.

Al-Shatibi said in "Al-I'tisam": "It is not far-fetched that one may repent from what he has seen and return to the truth," as was reported about Abdullah ibn al-Hasan al-Anbari, and what was narrated in the debate of Ibn Abbas with the Khawarij who revolted against Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, and in the debate of Umar ibn Abdul Aziz with some of them. However, the prevailing reality is the persistence in error.

-

ومن هنالك قلنا: يبعد أن يتوب بعضهم لأن الحديث يقتضي العموم بظاهره ...

وسبب بعده عن التوبة أن الدخول تحت تكاليف الشريعة صعب على النفس؛ لأنه أمر مخالف للهوى، وصاد عن سبيل الشهوات، فيثقل عليها جدًّا؛ لأن الحق ثقيل، والنفس إنما تنشط بما يوافق هواها، لا بما يخالفه، وكل بدعة فللهوى فيها مدخل؛ لأنها راجعة إلى نظر مخترعها ... **مع ضميمة أخرى، وهي أن المبتدع لا بد له من تعلق بشبهة دليل ينسبها إلى**

الشارع، ويدعي أن ما ذكره هو مقصود الشارع، فصار هواه مقصودًا بدليل شرعي في زعمه، فكيف يمكنه الخروج عن ذلك، وداعي الهوى مستمسك بحسن ما يتمسك به، وهو الدليل الشرعي في الجملة ؟.

وقد ذكر بعض من عرف حال الحدادية:-

وأيضًا من أوصافهم: إثارتهم لمسألة العُذر بالجَهل وتكفيرُهُم لمن يعذُرُ بالجهل وتضليلهم ثُمّ تكفيرهم لمن يعذُر بالجهل وهذا هُوَ محطّة تكفيرهم.

وكان هذا الحازمي آخر ما تكلم فيه وابتدع ((**تكفير العاذر بالجهل في الشرك المنتسب للإسلام قبل التبيين والتعريف**))

لا تعجل أيها القارئ الكريم وتقول ما دليلك على التفريق بين الأصلي والمتسب ؟

سيكون لنا ردودٌ على هذه الشبهة وأخواتها بإذن الله، وإنما أنا هنا لأبين وجه الشبه بين المعتزلة المعاصرين وبين شيوخهم المتقدمين .

وكان بادئ أمره يبدع العاذر ويقول إنها بدعة ثم انتقل بعد ذلك لما صار له أتباع فكفر العاذر ثم بعد ذلك كفر من لا يكفر العاذر.

وسيأتي عن قريب بتكفير بعض أتباعه إن لم يلتزموا التسلسل بل سيأتي عليه زمان بتكفير أئمة الدعوة إن لم يكن قد كفرهم بل ويلزمه ذلك ويلزمه أيضاً تكفير من تبعه ، بل إن بعض أتباعه وتلاميذه على حسب ما بلغنا من إخواننا في الجزيرة أنهم قد كفروا الثالث وبعضهم يكفر الرابع.

-

From there, we say: It is unlikely that some of them will repent because the hadith implies a generality in its apparent meaning. The reason for their distance from repentance is that adhering to the obligations of the Sharia is difficult for the soul; it goes against desires and diverts from the path of pleasures, making it very burdensome. The truth is heavy, and the soul is only energized by what aligns with its desires, not by what contradicts them. Every innovation has an entry point for desires, as it returns to a perspective with an additional consideration: the innovator must cling to a semblance of evidence that he attributes to its inventor, claiming that what he mentioned is the intent of the legislator. Thus, his desires become the goal supported by a legal proof in his view. How can he extricate himself from that when the call of desire is firmly attached to what he holds, which is the legal evidence in general?

Some who are familiar with the state of the Haddadiyyah have mentioned that another of their characteristics is their stirring up the issue of excusing ignorance and declaring as disbelievers those

who excuse ignorance, leading to their misguidance and then declaring them as disbelievers. This is the crux of their takfir (declaration of disbelief).

The last thing that al-Hazmi spoke about and innovated was the takfir of the excuser due to ignorance in the polytheism attributed to Islam before clarification and definition.

Do not rush, dear reader, to ask what your evidence is for distinguishing between the original and the attributed. We will respond to this doubt and its counterparts, God willing. I am here to clarify the similarities between contemporary Mu'tazila and their earlier scholars.

Initially, he would declare the excuser as an innovator and say it was an innovation. Then, after gaining followers, he declared the excuser as a disbeliever, and subsequently, he declared as disbelievers those who do not declare the excuser as a disbeliever.

Soon, he will come to declare some of his followers as disbelievers if they do not adhere to the chain of takfir. There will come a time when he will declare the Imams of the Da'wah as disbelievers if he has not already done so, and he will be obligated to do so, as well as to declare as disbelievers those who follow him. In fact, some of his followers and students, according to what we have been informed by our brothers in the island, have declared the third (generation) as disbelievers, and some even declare the fourth as disbelievers.

-

وهذا شأن أهل البدع يبتدعون أقوالا ويكفرون من خالفهم كما قال شيخ الاسلام ابن تيمية في منهاج السنة ٥/٩٥: [ولكن من شأن أهل البدع أنهم يبتدعون أقوالاً يجعلونها واجبةً في الدين بل يجعلونها من الإيمان الذي لا بد منه ، ويكفرون من خالفهم فيها ويستحلون دمه كفعل الخوارج والجهمية والرافضة والمعتزلة وغيرهم . وأهل السنة لا

-
This is the nature of the people of

يبتدعون قولاً ولا يكفرون من اجتهد فأخطأ وإن كان مخالفاً لهم مستحلاً لدمائهم ؛ كما لم تكفر الصحابةُ الخوارج مع تكفيرهم لعثمان وعلي ومن والاهما ، واستحلالهم لدماء المسلمين المخالفين لهم].

أصل الإشكال الأول :

وأصل الإشكال عند الحازمية العاذرية أنهم لم يفرقوا بين الكفر والتكفير فظنوا أنهما واحد وهذا خطأ فاحش، ذلك أن الكفر إنما يكون على الفعل وهو الشرك والتكفير يكون على الفاعل.

فالأول من جهله أو جعله توحيداً أو لم ينكره فهذا كافر بل لم يدخل في الإسلام.

والثاني متعلقه الأسماء والأحكام ويجب إعمال الشروط والموانع فيه **وهذا لا يكون إلا في المسائل الخفية**.

فجعلوا تكفير الكافر من أصل الدين فلم يقبلوا بهذه الأعذار لأن أصل الدين الذي قرروه لا يقبل فيه العذر بالجهل أو بالتأويل.

فطردوا أحكام الكفر فجعلوها في التكفير فضلوا وأضلوا ، فصار هذا عندهم هو الأصل في الدين ومن خالفهم فيه أو جهله أو شك فيه فهو كافر.

إختلافهم في مناط ووصف العاذر بالكفر :

وأيضا فهم مختلفون في مناط كفر العاذر فتارةً يكون كفره لأنه لم يفهم حقيقة التوحيد وتارة يكون كفره لأنه لم يكفر بالطاغوت وتارة يكون كفره قد أنكر معلوما من الدين بالضرورة ثم تجدهم ينقلون عن أهل العلم أن مناط كفرهم تكذيب النصوص وردها.

مناط كفر العاذر : -

innovation; they innovate statements and declare as disbelievers those who oppose them. As Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said in "Minhaj al-Sunnah" (5/95): "But it is characteristic of the people of innovation that they innovate statements which they make obligatory in religion, and they consider them to be part of the faith that is indispensable. They declare as disbelievers those who oppose them in this and deem it permissible to spill their blood, as is the case with the Khawarij, the Jahmiyyah, the Rafidah, the Mu'tazila, and others. The people of the Sunnah do not innovate statements nor do they declare as disbelievers those who strive and err, even if they oppose them and deem it permissible to spill their blood; just as the Companions did not declare the Khawarij as disbelievers, despite the fact that they declared Uthman and Ali, along with their supporters, as disbelievers and deemed it permissible to spill the blood of Muslims who opposed them."

The Root of the First Issue:
The root of the issue with the Haddadiyyah al-'Azhariyyah is that they do not differentiate between disbelief (kufr) and declaring someone a disbeliever (takfir). They mistakenly believe that they are the same, which is a grave error. Disbelief pertains to the action, which is polytheism (shirk), while takfir pertains to the doer. The former applies to someone who is ignorant of the truth of Tawhid, who considers it to be Tawhid, or who does not deny it; such a person is a disbeliever and has not

entered Islam. The latter relates to names and rulings, and the conditions and impediments must be applied in this context, which only occurs in subtle matters.

They made the takfir of the disbeliever a fundamental aspect of the religion, rejecting any excuses because the foundational principles they established do not accept excuses based on ignorance or misinterpretation. They extended the rulings of disbelief and made them applicable to takfir, leading them astray and causing them to mislead others. This became, for them, the foundation of the religion, and anyone who opposes them in this or is ignorant of it or doubts it is considered a disbeliever.

Their Disagreement on the Basis and Description of the Excuser's Disbelief:
They also differ regarding the basis for the excuser's disbelief. Sometimes they claim that his disbelief is due to not understanding the reality of Tawhid, at other times it is because he did not declare disbelief in the Taghut (false gods), and at other times it is because he denied something that is known by necessity in the religion. Then you find them quoting scholars who state that the basis for their disbelief is the denial of the texts and their rejection.

فتسمية المشرك مسلما مناط كفره تكذيب النص ورده ، فإن كان هذا الأمر ظاهرا عند الخاصة والعامة "يكون والحالة هذه معلوم بالضرورة من دين الإسلام كفره " .

أما إن جهله كثير من الخاصة قبل العامة فهذا لا يشك أنها تكون مسألة خفية لا يكفر العاذر فيها ابتداء حتى يبين له ويعرف فإن أصر بعد ذلك وعاند كفر.

The Basis for the Excuser's Disbelief:

Thus, the labeling of a polytheist (mushrik) as a Muslim is a basis for his disbelief, as it involves the denial and rejection of the texts. If this matter is apparent to both the knowledgeable and the general public, then it is, in this case, something that is known by necessity in the religion of Islam, and his disbelief is established.

However, if many of the general people (khassa) are unaware of this, let alone the general public, then it is undoubtedly a subtle matter in which the excuser (al-'aadhir) is not declared a disbeliever initially until it is clarified and made known to him. If he persists in his denial and obstinacy after that, then he is declared a disbeliever.

أصل الإشكال الثاني :

فطرد المسائل الظاهرة في كل مكان وزمان هو من صلب الإشكال والضلال عند العاذرية الحازمية وإن قالوا نحن نراعي ذلك .

والمسائل الظاهرة من أمور الشرائع وبلوغها ليس أمراً ثابتاً في كل مكان وزمان ولا لكل شخص بل تتنوع فيكون ظاهراً في مكان وزمان مالا يكون ظاهراً في مكان آخر وزمان آخر وبالنسبة لشخص آخر، فقد تكون في زمان ظاهرة وفي زمان خفية .

-

The root of the second issue:

The insistence on making evident matters universally applicable across all places and times is at the heart of the problem and deviation within the Hazimiyyah Adhiriyyah, even though they claim to account for that.

Evident matters related to religious rulings and their reach are not fixed in all places and times, nor for every individual. They vary, so what is evident in one place and time may not be so in another place and time, or for another person. Something may be evident at one time and hidden at another.

-

يوضح ذلك ماقاله شيخ الإسلام في مجموع الفتاوى ١٣ / ٦٤ ((...وَكُلُّ مَنْ خَالَفَ مَا جَاءَ بِهِ الرَّسُولُ لَمْ يَكُنْ عِنْدَهُ عِلْمٌ بِذَلِكَ وَلَا عَدْلٌ بَلْ لَا يَكُونُ عِنْدَهُ إلَّا جَهْلٌ وَظُلْمٌ وَظَنٌّ (**وَمَا تَهْوَى الْأَنْفُسُ وَلَقَدْ جَاءَهُمْ مِنْ رَبِّهِمُ الْهُدَى**) وَذَلِكَ لِأَنَّ مَا أَخْبَرَ بِهِ الرَّسُولُ فَهُوَ حَقٌّ بَاطِنًا وَظَاهِرًا فَلَا يُمْكِنُ أَنْ يُتَصَوَّرَ أَنْ يَكُونَ الْحَقُّ فِي نَقِيضِهِ ؛ وَحِينَئِذٍ فَمَنْ اعْتَقَدَ نَقِيضَهُ كَانَ اعْتِقَادُهُ بَاطِلًا وَالِاعْتِقَادُ الْبَاطِلُ لَا يَكُونُ عِلْمًا وَمَا أَمَرَ بِهِ الرَّسُولُ فَهُوَ عَدْلٌ لَا ظُلْمَ فِيهِ فَمَنْ نَهَى عَنْهُ فَقَدْ نَهَى عَنْ الْعَدْلِ وَمَنْ أَمَرَ بِضِدِّهِ فَقَدْ أَمَرَ بِالظُّلْمِ ؛ فَإِنَّ ضِدَّ الْعَدْلِ الظُّلْمُ فَلَا يَكُونُ مَا يُخَالِفُهُ إلَّا جَهْلًا وَظُلْمًا ظَنًّا وَمَا تَهْوَى الْأَنْفُسُ وَهُوَ لَا يَخْرُجُ عَنْ قِسْمَيْنِ أَحْسَنُهُمَا أَنْ يَكُونَ كَانَ شَرْعًا لِبَعْضِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ ثُمَّ نُسِخَ وَأَدْنَاهُمَا أَنْ يَكُونَ مَا شُرِعَ قَطُّ ؛ بَلْ يَكُونَ مِنْ الْمُبَدَّلِ فَكُلُّ مَا خَالَفَ حُكْمَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ فَإِمَّا شَرْعٌ مَنْسُوخٌ وَإِمَّا شَرْعٌ مُبَدَّلٌ مَا شَرَعَهُ اللَّهُ ؛ بَلْ شَرَعَهُ شَارِعٌ بِغَيْرِ إذْنٍ مِنْ اللَّهِ كَمَا قَالَ : (**أَمْ لَهُمْ شُرَكَاءُ شَرَعُوا لَهُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا لَمْ يَأْذَنْ بِهِ اللَّهُ**) لَكِنَّ هَذَا وَهَذَا قَدْ يَقَعَانِ فِي خَفِيِّ الْأُمُورِ وَدَقِيقِهَا بِاجْتِهَادِ مِنْ أَصْحَابِهَا اسْتَفْرَغُوا فِيهِ وُسْعَهُمْ فِي طَلَبِ الْحَقِّ وَيَكُونُ لَهُمْ مِنْ الصَّوَابِ وَالِاتِّبَاعِ مَا يَغْمُرُ ذَلِكَ، كَمَا وَقَعَ مِثْلُ ذَلِكَ مِنْ بَعْضِ الصَّحَابَةِ فِي مَسَائِلِ الطَّلَاقِ وَالْفَرَائِضِ وَنَحْوِ ذَلِكَ ؛ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ مِنْهُمْ مِثْلُ هَذَا فِي جَلِيِّ الْأُمُورِ وَجَلِيلِهَا ؛ لِأَنَّ بَيَانَ هَذَا مِنْ الرَّسُولِ كَانَ ظَاهِرًا بَيْنَهُمْ فَلَا يُخَالِفُهُ إلَّا مَنْ يُخَالِفُ الرَّسُولَ وَهُمْ مُعْتَصِمُونَ بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ يُحَكِّمُونَ الرَّسُولَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ لَا يَتَقَدَّمُونَ بَيْنَ يَدَيْ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ فَضْلًا عَنْ تَعَمُّدِ مُخَالَفَةِ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ . فَلَمَّا طَالَ الزَّمَانُ خَفِيَ عَلَى كَثِيرٍ مِنْ النَّاسِ مَا كَانَ ظَاهِرًا لَهُمْ وَدَقَّ عَلَى كَثِيرٍ مِنْ النَّاسِ مَا كَانَ جَلِيًّا لَهُمْ فَكَثُرَ مِنْ الْمُتَأَخِّرِينَ مُخَالَفَةُ الْكِتَابِ وَالسُّنَّةِ مَا لَمْ يَكُنْ مِثْلُ هَذَا فِي السَّلَفِ .

-

This explains what Sheikh al-Islam said in Majmu' al-Fatawa 64/13: "And everyone who opposes what the Messenger has brought does not have knowledge of that nor justice; rather, they only possess ignorance and injustice, and assumptions based on what the souls desire. Indeed, guidance has come to them from their Lord. This is because what the Messenger has informed is the truth, both hidden and apparent, and it is impossible to conceive that the truth could be in contradiction to it. Therefore, whoever believes in its contradiction has a false belief, and false belief is not knowledge. What the Messenger has commanded is justice, and there is no injustice in it. Whoever forbids it has forbidden justice, and whoever commands its opposite has commanded injustice; for the opposite of justice is injustice. Thus, what contradicts it can only be ignorance and injustice based on assumptions and what the souls desire. It does not go beyond two categories: the better of them is that it was a law for some of the prophets and then abrogated, and the lesser of them is that it is something that was never legislated at all; rather, it is something that has been altered. Therefore, everything that contradicts the ruling of Allah and His Messenger is either an abrogated law or an altered law that Allah did not legislate; rather, it was legislated by a legislator without permission from Allah, as He said: 'Or do they have partners who have legislated for them in religion that which Allah has not permitted?' However, both of these may occur in subtle and intricate matters through the ijtihad of their companions who exerted their utmost in seeking the truth, and they may have some correctness and adherence to that, as occurred with some of the

companions in matters of divorce, inheritance, and similar issues. And there was not among them anything like this in clear and significant matters; because the clarification of this from the Messenger was evident among them, and no one opposes it except one who opposes the Messenger, and they are holding firmly to the rope of Allah, judging the Messenger in what has arisen among them, not advancing before Allah and His Messenger, let alone intentionally opposing Allah and His Messenger. When time passed, what was evident became hidden to many people, and what was clear became obscure to many people, so the number of later generations who opposed the Book and the Sunnah increased, which was not the case among the predecessors."

-

وَإِنْ كَانُوا مَعَ هَذَا مُجْتَهِدِينَ مَعْذُورِينَ يَغْفِرُ اللهُ لَهُمْ خَطَايَاهُمْ وَيُثِيبُهُمْ عَلَى اجْتِهَادِهِمْ وَقَدْ يَكُونُ لَهُمْ مِنْ الْحَسَنَاتِ مَا يَكُونُ لِلْعَامِلِ مِنْهُمْ أَجْرُ خَمْسِينَ رَجُلًا يَعْمَلُهَا فِي ذَلِكَ الزَّمَانِ ؛ لِأَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يَجِدُونَ مَنْ يُعِينُهُمْ عَلَى ذَلِكَ وَهَؤُلَاءِ الْمُتَأَخِّرُونَ لَمْ يَجِدُوا مَنْ يُعِينُهُمْ عَلَى ذَلِكَ)).

تامل : كيف عذرهم رغم كونهم خالفوا ما كان ظاهراً جليا فيمن كان قبلهم.

وقال ايضا في مجموع الفتاوى ١١٨/١٣: ((و أَيْضًا فَكَوْنُ الشَّيْءِ مَعْلُومًا مِنْ الدِّينِ ضَرُورَةً أَمْرٌ إضَافِيٌّ فَحَدِيثُ الْعَهْدِ بِالْإِسْلَامِ وَمَنْ نَشَأَ بِبَادِيَةٍ بَعِيدَةٍ قَدْ لَا يَعْلَمُ هَذَا بِالْكُلِّيَّةِ فَضْلًا عَنْ كَوْنِهِ يَعْلَمُهُ بِالضَّرُورَةِ وَكَثِيرٌ مِنْ الْعُلَمَاءِ يَعْلَمُ بِالضَّرُورَةِ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ ﷺ سَجَدَ لِلسَّهْوِ وَقَضَى بِالدِّيَةِ عَلَى الْعَاقِلَةِ وَقَضَى أَنَّ الْوَلَدَ لِلْفِرَاشِ وَغَيْرُ **ذَلِكَ مِمَّا يَعْلَمُهُ الْخَاصَّةُ بِالضَّرُورَةِ وَأَكْثَرُ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُهُ أَلْبَتَّةَ**)).

فإذا علمنا أن التكفير حكم شرعي كسائر الأحكام الشرعية فالعذر الوارد على من لم يكفر الكافر ترجع إلى ذات الأعذار التي تثبت لمن يكذب بالنصوص ويردها.

وتكفير العاذر المنتسب للإسلام لا يعلمه كثير من أهل العلم في هذا الزمان فكيف بعامة الناس!!

وقال أيضا رحمه الله في مجموع الفتاوى ٧/ ٦٠٩: " **أما الفرائض الأربع، فإذا جحد وجوب شيء منها بعد بلوغ الحجة فهو كافر، وكذلك من جحد تحريم شيء من المحرمات الظاهرة المتواتر تحريمها كالفواحش والظلم والكذب والخمر ونحو ذلك.**

وأما من لم تقم عليه الحجة مثل أن يكون حديث عهد بإسلام، أو نشأ ببادية بعيدة لم تبلغه فيها شرائع الإسلام ونحو ذلك، أو غلط فظن أن الذين آمنوا وعملوا الصالحات يستثنون من تحريم الخمر، كما غلط في ذلك الذين استتابهم عمر وأمثال ذلك، فإنهم يستتابون وتقام الحجة عليهم، فإن أصروا كفروا حينئذ، ولا يحكم بكفرهم قبل ذلك ".

-
"And even if they were, with this, striving and excused, Allah forgives their sins and rewards them for their efforts, and they may have from the good deeds what is equivalent to the reward of fifty men among them who perform it in that time; because they found someone to assist them in that, while these later generations did not find anyone to assist them in that."

"Reflect: how he excused them despite their opposition to what was clear and evident among those who preceded them."

He also said in Majmu' al-Fatawa 118/13: "And also, the fact that something is known to be part of the religion is an additional matter. A person who has recently embraced Islam or who has grown up in a remote desert may not know this at all, let alone know it necessarily. Many scholars know necessarily that the Prophet (peace be upon him) prostrated for forgetfulness, ruled that blood money is to be paid by the family, and ruled that the child belongs to the marital bed, among other things that are necessarily known to the knowledgeable, while most people do not know them."

"If we understand that takfir (declaring someone a disbeliever) is a legal ruling like other legal rulings, then the excuses applicable to those who do not declare a disbeliever as such return to the same excuses that apply to those who deny the texts and reject them. The takfir of someone who is excused and claims to be a Muslim is not known by many scholars in this time, so how about the general public!"

He also said, may Allah have mercy on him, in Majmu' al-Fatawa 609/7: "As for the four obligatory acts, if someone denies the obligation of any of them after the proof has been established, he is a disbeliever. Likewise, anyone who denies the prohibition of any of the apparent and widely known prohibitions, such as immorality, injustice, lying, alcohol, and similar things.

As for someone upon whom the proof has not been established, such as one who has recently embraced Islam, or who has grown up in a remote desert where the laws of Islam have not reached him, or who mistakenly believes that those who have faith and do righteous deeds are exempt from the prohibition of alcohol, as those whom Umar (may Allah be pleased with him) sought to bring back to the truth, they are to be given a chance to repent and the proof is to be established against them. If they persist, they will then be declared disbelievers, but their disbelief is not judged before that."

-

وقال السيوطي في الأشباه والنظائر :(كل من جهل تحريم شيء **مما يشترك فيه غالب الناس** لم يقبل منه دعوى الجهل، إلا أن يكون قريب عهد بالإسلام أو نشأ ببادية بعيدة يخفى فيها مثل ذلك، كتحريم الزنى والقتل والسرقة والخمر والكلام في الصلاة والأكل في الصوم).

فنسأل الشيخ الحازمي هل تكفير العاذر المنتسب للإسلام علمه وظهوره مما يشترك فيه غالب الناس ؟

نترك الإجابة للشيخ نفسه فقد قال **عمن يعذر بالجهل :-** (.....لا يمكن أن يصل إلى إيصال الحق إلا بأن يعرف السياسة الشرعية فيما يتعلق بالدعوة إلى الله **ولا سيما مصر شيوخهم المشهورون في أصول التكفير على منهج الجهم بن صفوان فعندهم هذه المسألة الذي يطرحها يكون خارجيا بالإتفاق لا خلاف عندهم كل من اعتقد أن هؤلاء المشركين لا يعذرون بالجهل وأنهم كفار مشركون وهذا يقاطع بل يضرب ، ولذلك لما طرحت المسألة قال لي بعض الطلبة الخواص : أنك لولا أن لك قاعدة عند بعض الطلبة الذين يعرفوني ويتابعون الموقع ونحو ذلك لقامت ثورة ثانية لأن هذا القول لا يكاد يعرف...)**

فكلامه هذا حجة عليه .

وقال أيضا شيخ الإسلام كما في مجموع الفتاوى ١٩/ ٢١٠ ((**فمن قال إن المخطيء في مسألة قطعية أو ظنية يأثم فقد خالف الكتاب والسنة والإجماع القديم** ، قالوا وأيضا فكون المسألة قطعية أو ظنية هو أمر إضافي بحسب حال المعتقدين ليس هو وصفا للقول في نفسه فإن الإنسان قد يقطع بأشياء علمها بالضرورة أو بالنقل المعلوم صدقه عنده وغيره لا يعرف ذلك لا قطعا ولا ظنا وقد يكون الإنسان ذكيا قوي الذهن سريع الإدراك علما وظنا فيعرف من الحق ويقطع به ما لا يتصوره غيره ولا يعرفه لا علما ولا ظنا فالقطع والظن يكون بحسب ما وصل إلى الإنسان من الأدلة وبحسب قدرته على الإستدلال ، والناس يختلفون في هذا وهذا فكون المسألة قطعية أو ظنية ليس هو صفة ملازمة للقول المتنازع فيه حتى يقال كل من خالفه قد خالف القطعي بل هو صفة لحال الناظر المستدل المعتقد وهذا مما يختلف فيه الناس فعلم أن هذا الفرق لا يطرد ولا ينعكس)).

-
Al-Suyuti said in "Al-Ashbah wa al-Nazair": "Anyone who is ignorant of the prohibition of something that most people share in does not have their claim of ignorance accepted, unless they are new to Islam or have grown up in a remote desert where such matters are hidden, like the prohibitions of adultery, murder, theft, alcohol, speaking during prayer, and eating during fasting."

So we ask Sheikh al-Hazmi: Is the takfir of someone who is excused and claims to be a Muslim something that is known and evident among most people? We leave the answer to the Sheikh himself, as he said about those who are excused due to ignorance: "It is not possible to convey the

truth except by understanding the proper Islamic governance regarding the call to Allah, especially in Egypt, where their well-known scholars follow the principles of takfir according to the methodology of Jahm ibn Safwan. For them, this issue is one that, when raised, is agreed upon to be external; there is no disagreement among them that anyone who believes that these polytheists are not excused due to ignorance and that they are disbelievers and polytheists should be opposed and struck. Therefore, when this issue was raised, some of the special students said to me: 'If it were not for the fact that you have a base among some students who know me and follow the site and so on, a second revolution would have erupted, because this statement is hardly known...'"

His words are a proof against him.

Sheikh al-Islam also said in Majmu' al-Fatawa 210/19: "Whoever says that the one who is mistaken in a matter that is definitive or speculative is sinful has contradicted the Book, the Sunnah, and the ancient consensus. They said: 'Moreover, whether the matter is definitive or speculative is an additional matter based on the state of the believers; it is not a description of the statement itself. A person may be certain of things they know necessarily or through reliable transmission, while others do not know that, neither definitively nor speculatively. A person may be intelligent, quick-witted, and perceptive in knowledge and speculation, knowing truths and being certain of them in ways that others cannot conceive or know, neither in knowledge nor in speculation. Certainty and speculation depend on the evidence that has reached a person and their ability to deduce. People differ in this regard, and thus, whether a matter is definitive or speculative is not an inherent characteristic of the disputed statement, so that it can be said that anyone who opposes it has opposed the definitive. Rather, it is a characteristic of the state of the observer, the one deducing, and the believer, and this is something that people differ in. Therefore, it is known that this distinction does not apply universally nor can it be reversed."

-

-

وهذا القول لابن تيمية - يعني أهل الكلام : **فمن قال إن المخطىء في مسألة قطعية أو ظنية يأثم فقد خالف الكتاب والسنة والإجماع القديم**

هو قول المعتزلة القدرية فعندهم أن المخطئ في المسائل القطعية أو الظنية أنه أثم كافر لا يعذر بجهله .

وهذا ماوقع فيه العاذرية الحازمية حيث جعلوا من لم يكفر العاذر المنتسب للإسلام أنه كافر ولم يعتبروا خفاء المسألة و جعلوا ماليس بظاهر ظاهرا فأثموا وكفروا من خالفهم.

فإذا تبين ذلك عرفنا أن الأمر مرده إلى ظهور المسألة من خفائها وهل علمها الخاص والعام .

ومن هنا فرقنا بين الكافر الأصلي كاليهود والنصارى وبين المنتسب للإسلام فالأول كفره ظاهر للعامة قبل الخاصة.

فلو سألت أي عامي عن من لا يكفر اليهود والنصارى لقال لك وبدون تردد أنه كافر ، وأما الثاني المنتسب للإسلام فأكثر أهل العلم الذين أشربت قلوبهم الإرجاء لا يكفرونه " و قولهم لا شك أنه باطل " فكيف بعامة الناس ؟

فالعاذر عنده شبهة في الموانع حيث جعل الجهل مانعا من موانع التكفير، ألا ترى أننا لا نعذر من لا يكفر اليهود والنصارى بجهله وما ذاك إلا لأن المسألة من أظهر المسائل وضوحا وظهورا.

فإن قال الشيخ الحازمي هدانا الله وإياه للحق أنا أعتبر المسائل الخفية إن كانت خفية وأعمل فيها الشروط والموانع.

قلنا له لم يحصل منك هذا ألبته بل جعلتها من المسائل المعلومة من الدين بالضرورة وذلك حينما أقررت وقلت لما تعذرت عن نفسك في مصر في فتواك المشهورة لما جوزت فعل الردة على أصلك الفاسد حين قلت :-

This statement by Ibn Taymiyyah regarding the people of rhetoric means: "Whoever says that the one who is mistaken in a definitive or speculative matter is sinful has contradicted the Book, the Sunnah, and the ancient consensus." This is the view of the Mu'tazila and the Qadarites, who believe that the one who errs in definitive or speculative matters is sinful and a disbeliever, and is not excused for their ignorance.

This is what the followers of al-Hazmi have fallen into, as they consider anyone who does not declare the excused person who claims to be a Muslim as a disbeliever to be a disbeliever themselves, without considering the obscurity of the matter, and they have made what is not apparent to be apparent. Thus, they have sinned and declared as disbelievers those who oppose them. When this is clarified, we understand that the matter returns to the visibility of the issue from its obscurity and whether it is known to the general or the specific.

From here, we differentiate between the original disbeliever, such as the Jews and Christians, and the one who claims to be a Muslim. The disbelief of the former is apparent to the general public before the specific individuals. If you were to ask any layperson about someone who does not declare the Jews and Christians as disbelievers, they would tell you without hesitation that he is a disbeliever. As for the latter, the one who claims to be a Muslim, most scholars whose hearts have been influenced by the concept of irja' do not declare him a disbeliever, and their statement is undoubtedly false. So how about the general public?

The excuser has a doubt regarding the impediments, as they consider ignorance to be an impediment to takfir. Do you not see that we do not excuse someone who does not declare the Jews and Christians as disbelievers due to their ignorance? This is only because the matter is one of the most apparent issues in clarity and visibility.

If Sheikh al-Hazmi, may Allah guide him and us to the truth, says that he considers obscure matters as such and applies the conditions and impediments to them, we would say to him that you have not done this at all; rather, you have made them among the matters known by necessity in the religion. This is evident when you excused yourself in Egypt in your famous fatwa when you permitted the act of apostasy based on your corrupt principle when you said: -

{...تريد أن تقلد من لا يعذر لا بأس تريد أن تقلد من يعذر لا بأس يعني لا تجعل الموضوع كأنه فيْصل إما إسلام وإما كفر}.

فلما بين لك طلابك المخلصون قالوا لك :- ياشيخ هذا الفعل كفر وأنت غير مكره ، أضطررت أن تخرج بيانا صوتيا لتبرر قولك الكفري-على أصلك الذي لا تعذر به - فقلت:-

(.....لا يمكن أن يصل إلى إيصال الحق إلا بأن يعرف السياسة الشرعية فيما يتعلق بالدعوة إلى الله ولا سيما مصر **شيوخهم المشهورون في أصول التكفير على منهج الجهم بن صفوان فعندهم هذه المسألة الذي يطرحها يكون خارجيا بالإتفاق لا خلاف عندهم كل من اعتقد أن هؤلاء المشركين لا يعذرون بالجهل وأنهم كفار مشركون وهذا يقاطع بل يضرب** ، ولذلك لما طرحت المسألة قال لي بعض الطلبة الخواص : أنك لولا أن لك قاعدة عند بعض الطلبة الذين يعرفوني ويتابعون الموقع ونحو ذلك لقامت ثورة ثانية لأن هذا القول لا يكاد يعرف ...)

فهل بعد كلامك هذا عن الحقيقة الواقعة تعتبر هذه المسألة من المسائل الظاهرة التي لا يعذر الجاهل فيها أم أنها تعتبر من المسائل الخفية ؟

فإذا كان شيوخهم وطلبة العلم وهؤلاء يعتبرون الخاصة يجهلون هذه المسألة فكيف بعامة الناس ؟ فقد قلت أن هذه القول **لا يكاد يعرف** فأنت هنا أقررت وأكدت أن هذه المسألة من أشد المسائل خفاء وفي تنزيل الحكم جعلتها من المسائل الظاهرة ولم تعذر فيها ، فأي تناقض بعد هذا ؟!!

فإن لم تكن تلك مسألة خفية فلا أعلم ما هي المسائل الخفية.

وهذا ليس في مصر فحسب بل في كل أصقاع الأرض حتى عندكم في الجزيرة شيوخكم المشهورون يعذرون بالجهل .

-

"...You want to follow those who do not excuse ignorance—no problem. You want to follow those who excuse ignorance—no problem. Meaning, do not make the issue as though it is a decisive matter between Islam and disbelief.

When your sincere students clarified for you and said: 'Sheikh, this action is disbelief, and you are not under compulsion,' you were forced to release an audio statement to justify your statement of disbelief—based on your principle where you do not excuse ignorance.

You then said:
"...The truth cannot be conveyed unless one understands *Shari'ah politics* regarding الدعوة إلى الله (calling to Allah), particularly in Egypt, where their prominent scholars in the principles of *Takfir* follow the methodology of Jahm bin Safwan. For them, this issue—when raised—categorizes a person as *Khariji* (a Khawarij) by consensus. There is no disagreement among them that whoever believes that these polytheists are not excused due to ignorance and considers them disbelievers is ostracized, even beaten. Therefore, when I raised this issue, some close students told me: 'If you did not have a foundation among certain students who know me, follow the website, and so on, a second revolution would have erupted, because this statement is hardly known...'"

So, after these words and the evident reality, do you still consider this issue one of the "clear matters" in which the ignorant are not excused, or is it one of the "hidden matters"? If their scholars, students of knowledge, and even their elite are ignorant of this issue, then how about the general public?

You yourself said that this statement is hardly known. Here, you admitted and confirmed that this issue is one of the most hidden matters. Yet, when it comes to applying the ruling, you treated it as one of the "clear matters" and did not excuse ignorance. What greater contradiction is there than this?!

If this is not a hidden matter, then I do not know what qualifies as a hidden matter.

And this is not only the case in Egypt but in every corner of the earth—even among you in the Arabian Peninsula. Your prominent scholars excuse ignorance."

ضابط المسألة الظاهرة والخفية:-

وأهل العلم قد تكلموا عن ضابط المسألة الظاهرة والخفية فقالوا:-

ضابط المسألة الظاهرة :-

- مسائل لا يسع المكلف جهلها سموها علم العامة.

- مسائل قطعية معلومة من الدين بالضرورة .

- مسائل ظاهرة الحجة تقام فيها بكتاب الله وبلوغه.

- كل علم ظهرت أدلته وأجمعت عليه الأمة وظهر علمها للخاص والعام " **وهذا الضابط أضبطها وأشملها فالظهور الذي علق الله عليه الأحكام هو ظهوره بين الناس** " .

ضابط المسألة الخفية :-

- هي المسائل التي يعلمها الخاص دون العام وذلك لخفائها وعدم اشتهارها.
- مسائل يسع المكلف جهلها سموها علم الخاصة .
- مسائل غير معلومة من الدين بالضرورة.
- مسائل خفية لا بد فيها من إقامة الحجة وتفهيمها.

وعدم تكفير العاذر لا يعلمه أكثر الخاصة فكيف بالعامة.

والشيخ الحازمي يقرر هذا في دروسه ، فنسأل الحازمي هل هذه المسألة علمها الخاص قبل العام عندكم في الجزيرة ؟

قطعا لا بل تعتبر من أشد المسائل خفاء.

-

The Criterion for Clear and Hidden Issues

The scholars have discussed the criterion for distinguishing between clear and hidden issues, and they said:

Criterion for a Clear Issue:

- These are issues that a legally responsible person (*mukallaf*) cannot be ignorant of, and they are referred to as *"general knowledge"* (علم العامة).

- They are definitive matters that are known necessarily as part of the religion.
- These are issues where the evidence is clear, established by the Book of Allah, and has reached people.
- Any knowledge whose evidence is apparent, agreed upon by the *Ummah* (nation), and known both to the elite and the general public.
  - *This last criterion is the most precise and comprehensive, as the clarity upon which Allah based His rulings is its clarity among the people.*

Criterion for a Hidden Issue:

- These are issues known to the elite but not to the general public due to their obscurity and lack of widespread recognition.
- They are issues where a legally responsible person (*mukallaf*) may be excused for being ignorant, referred to as *"elite knowledge"* (علم الخاصة).
- They are not necessarily known matters of the religion.
- These are hidden matters where the proof must be established, clarified, and explained.
- *Not declaring someone a disbeliever for excusing ignorance* is something that even most of the elite do not know—so what about the general public?

Sheikh Al-Hazimi himself affirms this in his lessons. Therefore, we ask Al-Hazimi: *"Was this issue known to the elite before the general public in your region (the Arabian Peninsula)?"*
Certainly not. Rather, it is considered one of the most hidden matters.

توضيح مهم لما سبق :-

من بلغه حكم الله في المشركين-المنتسبين للإسلام- وتحقق لديه أنهم على غير دين الإسلام ، ثمَّ هو مازال يصر على إسلامهم فهذا نقض أصل دينه من جنس من رد حكما شرعياً عرف حكمه ثمَّ كذّب به ، حيث إن كل علم تحقق لصاحبه أنه من دين الله فقد صار من أصل دينه الإيمان به وإن لم يفعل فقد كفر .

فبذلك فقط يكون تكفير المشركين من أصل الدين ، باعتبار بلوغ العلم لصاحبه وتحققه من المسألة ثم جحده لها ، من جنس أي حكم شرعي عرف صاحبه صحته فجحده .

وأن تكفير العاذر من عدمه ترجع إلى الشروط والموانع وهل هذه المسألة ظاهرة أم خفية.

فلا يجادل أحدٌ في أن تكفير العاذر من أشد المسائل خفاء في هذا الزمان خاصة وأن الإرجاء أصبح وكأنه عقيدة أهل السنة والجماعة في هذا الزمان كمثل عقيدة الأشاعرة في زمن ابن تيميه وقبله أضحت وكأنها عقيدة أهل السنة والجماعة .

فإذا كان كثير من العلماء يعذرون بالجهل من تلبس بالشرك في هذا الزمان فكيف بالعامة وكيف بمن عذر العاذر ؟

والشاهد أنه لابد أن نعلم أن أصل ضلال الحازمية ناشئٌ من خلطهم بين الكفر والتكفير وعدم إعمال المسائل الظاهرة من الخفية والشروط والموانع.

والتكفير كما ذكرنا هو حكم شرعي لا يعلم بالعقل وإنما هو كما قال ابن الوزير اليماني في - العواصم والقواصم - أن التكفير سمعي محض لا مدخل للعقل فيه.

وقال شيخ الاسلام ابن تيميه رحمه الله في مجموع الفتاوى ١٢/٤٩٨ :

-

An Important Clarification of What Was Previously Mentioned:

Whoever has been informed of Allah's ruling regarding the polytheists who associate themselves with Islam, and it has been established for them that such individuals are not upon the religion of Islam, yet they persist in affirming their Islam—this constitutes a nullification of the foundation of their own religion. This is akin to rejecting a known legal ruling after recognizing and understanding it. When a person has certain knowledge that something is part of Allah's religion, it becomes fundamental to their faith to believe in it. Failure to do so constitutes disbelief.

Thus, declaring the polytheists to be disbelievers is part of the foundation of the religion[1], provided that the knowledge of the matter has reached the individual, they have verified its truth, and then denied it. This is similar to any legal ruling that a person recognizes as true but denies. As for whether one who excuses such individuals is themselves a disbeliever, this depends on the fulfillment of conditions and the absence of impediments, as well as whether the issue is apparent or obscure.

No one disputes that declaring the excuser a disbeliever is one of the most obscure matters in this age, especially as the doctrine of *irja'* (delaying judgment) has almost become synonymous with the creed of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah in our time, much like the Ash'arite creed during the time of Ibn Taymiyyah and earlier, when it appeared to be the creed of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah.

If many scholars excuse ignorance for those who fall into shirk in this age, how much more leniency should be shown to the common people? And what about those who excuse the excuser?

The point is that we must understand that the root of the error of the Hazimiyyah lies in their conflation of disbelief (*kufr*) with the act of declaring disbelief (*takfir*), as well as their failure to distinguish between apparent and obscure matters and between conditions and impediments.

Takfir, as we have mentioned, is a legal ruling that is not known through reason but is, as Ibn al-Wazir al-Yamani stated in *Al-ʿAwassim wal-Qawassim*, purely transmitted (*samʿi*) with no role for independent reasoning (*ʿaql*). Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said in *Majmuʿ al-Fatawa* (12/498):

Footnote: The term used by the Shaykh for "foundation of the religion" is Usool ad Deen and not Asl ad Din, important to differentiate in this context

-

[والاصل الثاني أن التكفير العام-كالوعيد العام- يجب القول بإطلاقه وعمومه وأما الحكم على المعين بأنه كافر او مشهود له بالنار : فهذا يقف على الدليل المعين فإن الحكم يقف على ثبوت شروطه وانتفاء موانعه]

وقال شيخ الاسلام ابن تيميه رحمه الله ﷻ مجموع الفتاوى ٥/ ٥٥٤

[فإن الايجاب والتحريم والثواب والعقاب والتكفير والتفسيق هو الى الله ورسوله ليس لأحد في هذا الحكم وانما على الناس إيجاب ما اوجبه الله ورسوله وتحريم ماحرمه الله ورسوله وتصديق ما اخبره الله ورسوله]

وقال شيخ الاسلام ابن تيميه رحمه الله ﷻ مجموع الفتاوى ١٢/ ٤٦٨

[-- إذا تبين ذلك فاعلم أن مسائل التكفير والتفسيق هي من مسائل الأسماء والأحكام التي يتعلق بها الوعد والوعيد في الدار الأخرة وتتعلق بها الموالاة والمعاداة والقتل والعِصمة وغير ذلك في الدار الدنيا --].

فالحازمي مضطرب في هذه متناقض جدا ،فمرة يجعلها من أصول الدين وكأنها مغروزة في الفطرة ومرة يجعلها من المسائل الظاهرة من الشرائع كتحريم الزنا وشرب الخمر وفي نفس الوقت يقر أن أكثر أهل العلم فضلا عن عوامهم يجهلون هذه المسألة.!!

فإن إخضاع الشروط والموانع وإعمال قول أهل العلم كما في قولهم مظنة علم أو مظنة جهل أو هل غيره يجهله إنما تكون في الأحكام في المسائل الخفية، وتكفير المشرك حكم شرعي كسائر الأحكام يرجع فيه إلى ظهور المسألة من خفائها إلى غير ذلك مما هو معروف.

فإذا بلغ العبد حكم الله في المشرك وتحقق لديه أنه على غير دين الإسلام ثم أصر وعاند فهذا نقض أصل دينه كمثل من يرد حكما شرعيا عرف حكمه ثم كذبه.

فقاعدة " **من لم يكفر المشرك أو شك في كفرهم أو صحح أو مذهبهم كفر**" هي كفر نوع لا كفر عين لا بد من إخضاع الشروط والموانع فيها...الخ.

-

Translation:

The second principle is that general takfir—like general warnings—must be stated broadly and inclusively. As for ruling on a specific individual as a disbeliever or testifying that they are destined for Hell, this depends on specific evidence. Such rulings require the fulfillment of their conditions and the absence of any impediments.

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said in *Majmu‘ al-Fatawa* (5/554):
“Indeed, obligation, prohibition, reward, punishment, takfir, and declaring someone corrupt (*tafsiq*) belong to Allah and His Messenger. No one has the right to make such judgments independently. People are only required to affirm what Allah and His Messenger have obligated, to prohibit what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited, and to believe what Allah and His Messenger have reported.”

He also said in *Majmu‘ al-Fatawa* (12/468):
“When this is understood, know that the issues of takfir and tafsiq are among the matters of [divine] names and rulings. They are linked to promises and warnings in the Hereafter, as well as to loyalty and enmity, killing, protection, and other matters in this world.”

The Hazimiyyah are highly inconsistent in this matter and very contradictory. At times, they treat takfir as part of the core principles of the religion, as if it were ingrained in human nature. At other times, they regard it as one of the apparent matters of the Shari‘ah, like the prohibition of adultery or drinking alcohol. Yet, at the same time, they admit that most scholars, let alone the general public, are ignorant of this issue!

The application of conditions and impediments, and acting upon the statements of scholars regarding whether knowledge or ignorance is presumed, is only relevant to rulings on obscure matters. Declaring a polytheist to be a disbeliever is a legal ruling like any other, and it depends on whether the issue is clear or obscure.

If a person has been informed of Allah’s ruling regarding a polytheist, has confirmed that they are not upon the religion of Islam, and yet persists and stubbornly opposes, this constitutes a nullification of their religion, like someone who rejects a known legal ruling after recognizing and understanding it.

Thus, the rule that “whoever does not declare a polytheist to be a disbeliever, doubts their disbelief, or affirms their beliefs is a disbeliever” applies to general takfir, not specific takfir. It must be subjected to the conditions and impediments ... etc.

-

فإن أكثر ما أشكل عليهم كلام أئمة الدعوة في كلامهم عن تكفير المشركين والبراءة منهم وكلامهم حق ولكن إنما عنوا بذلك بعد قيام الحجة يجب حينئذ تكفيرهم وتجد هذا في أكثر من موضع يقولون **"بعد التعريف"** أو **"بعد البيان"** أو **"بين له"** ولا يقال هذا إلا في المسائل الخفية ، ولم يذكروا ذلك فيمن استحل شرب الخمر أوفعل الزنا وهو بين المسلمين فلم يقولوا "يعرف أو يبين له حتى تزول عنه الشبهة" وما ذلك إلا لأن المسألة ظاهرة.

أما من يستدل بأقوالهم فيمن "لا يكفر المشرك المتلبس فهو كافرمثلهم ويلحق بهم" فقطعا إنها عنوا بذلك بعد قيام الحجة وإزالة الشبهة جمعا بين أقوالهم فكما يجب علينا رد المتشابه من القران والسنة إلى المحكم فكذلك يجب علينا رد المتشابه من أقوال أهل العلم إلى محكم أقوالهم وإلا لضربنا أقوال بعضهم ببعض ولكانوا متناقضين وحاشاهم من ذلك رحمهم الله تعالى[1].

وأضرب مثالاً للتوضيح لو أن رجلاً حنيفاً موَحداً أو أنه حديث عهد بإسلام ولم يبلغه رسول وقومه مشركون وثنيون وهو يقول إن فعلكم هذا باطل ومخالف للفطرة لكنه لم يكفرهم ، فهل مثل هذا يكفر ؟ هل يقال عنه أنه لم يكفر بالطاغوت أو أنه لم يعرف التوحيد أو أنه جعل الشرك توحيدا ؟

فإن قالوا لا، لا يكون ذلك .

قلنا لهم لماذا ؟ ألا يكون في هذه الحالة أنه لم يكفر بالطاغوت على زعمكم؟

سيقولون لا ،لأنه حديث عهد بإسلام .

قلنا لهم إن الكفر بالطاغوت وإنكار الشرك ومعرفة التوحيد كلها من أصل الدين ليس لها علاقة بالبلاغ وإنما البلاغ يكون في الشرائع من تحليل وتحريم وهذا ما أشكل

---

(١) وكنت سأنقل هنا كلام أئمة الدعوة في حكم العاذر وتوضيح أقوالهم وكشف تلاعب الحازمي باستدلالاتهم في تكفير العاذر بمتشابه أقوالهم وإغفاله عن توضيح مرادهم بأن ذلك لا يكون إلا بعد قيام الحجة.
إلا أني اثرت أن أفرد لها بحثا مستقلا

-

What most confused them was the speech of the leaders of the [Islamic] call regarding their statements about declaring polytheists as disbelievers and dissociating from them. Their words are truthful, but they referred to this [declaration of disbelief] after the establishment of the evidence. Only then must they be declared disbelievers. You will find this in several instances where they say

“after clarification” or “after explanation” or “it was explained to him.” This is only said in matters that are unclear. They did not mention this regarding someone who deems drinking alcohol or committing adultery permissible while living among Muslims. They did not say that it should be clarified or explained to him until the doubt is removed—because the matter is evident.

As for those who cite their statements regarding “one who does not declare the polytheist engaged in shirk a disbeliever, he is like them and joins their ranks,” they certainly meant this only after the establishment of the evidence and the removal of doubts. This is to reconcile their statements. Just as we are obligated to interpret the ambiguous verses of the Qur’an and hadith in light of the clear ones, we must also interpret the ambiguous statements of scholars in light of their clear ones. Otherwise, we would pit their words against one another, making them seem contradictory—far be it from them, may Allah have mercy on them.

To clarify with an example: Suppose there is a man who is monotheistic or newly converted to Islam, living among a pagan and idolatrous community, and he says, “Your actions are false and contrary to natural disposition,” but he does not declare them disbelievers. Would such a person be declared a disbeliever? Would we say of him that he did not disbelieve in the false deity, or that he did not understand monotheism, or that he equated shirk (polytheism) with tawheed (monotheism)?

If they say, “No, he would not be declared a disbeliever,” we would then ask them, “Why not? Wouldn’t this imply that he did not disbelieve in the false deity according to your claims?” They would respond, “No, because he is newly converted to Islam.”

We would reply, “Indeed, disbelief in the false deity, the rejection of shirk, and understanding monotheism are fundamental aspects of religion and are not related to [the requirement of] the message reaching them. The message applies to the branches of religion, such as what is permissible or impermissible.”

This is what has caused confusion.

Footnote:

(1) I was going to quote here the statements of the leaders of the [Islamic] call regarding the ruling on excusing someone and clarify their statements. I intended to expose the manipulations of Hazimi in using their ambiguous statements to declare those who excuse [polytheists] as disbelievers while ignoring their clarification that such judgments are only made after the establishment of the evidence. However, I preferred to dedicate a separate study to this matter.

عليكم ، فخلطكم بين أصول الدين وبين مادون ذلك من أصول الشرائع أوقعكم فيما أنتم فيه ، فإنما أوتيتم من قبل هذا.

والتكفير حكم شرعي ولم يبلغ هذا الرجل هذا الحكم الشرعي كما لو أنّه قال شرب الخمر حلال فهل يكفر ؟؟ قطعاً لا يكفر لانه لم تبلغه الشرائع فيعذر بهذا ..فلم عذرتم من استحل شرب الخمر ولم تعذروا من لم يكفر المشرك وكلاهما حكمان شرعيان كسائر الأحكام ؟

ويزيد الأمر وضوحاً لو قال هذا الرجل من كان حديث عهد بإسلام أن فعلكم وشرككم صحيح أو لم ينكره الشرك ، في هذه الحاله يكون كافراً لأنه لم يكفر بالطاغوت ولم يعرف التوحيد ولم ينكر الشرك بله لم يدخل في الإسلام .

فلما حصل الخلط الفاحش والجهل الكبير عند الحازمي وأتباعه بين الكفر والتكفير وبين أصول الدين وأصول الشرائع وبين المسائل الظاهرة والخفية كفروا المسلمين واستحلوا دماءهم والعياذ بالله .

ختاما لهذا الجزء أنقل كلاما مهما نقلته من الشبكة العنكبوتية من معرف عرف بنفسه " القامع "

"يجب التفريق بين الشرك و الشرائع الظاهرة فالمسلم الذي ينكر شريعة ظاهرة وكان حديث عهد بإسلام أو نشأ ببلد الكفار أو عائشا في بادية بعيدة فإنه يعذر بجهله و لا يلحقه اسم الردة لان الشرائع لا تلزم الا بعد بلوغها أما لو تلبس بالشرك و كان من الثلاثة وهو موحّد معه أصل الإيمان فاسم الشرك و الردة يلحقانه ولكن لا يلحقه اسم كفر القتل و التعذيب حتى تقوم عليه الحجة".

---

(٢) وهذا هو رابط الموضوع فإنه مهم جدا ونافع من أفضل ما قرأت في العذر بالجهل : تأصيلات في العذر بالجهل
http://cutt.us/hcXGJ

-

The text translates to the following:

You have erred by conflating the fundamentals of religion with matters below them, such as the fundamentals of the religious ordinances, and this has led you to the confusion you are in. Indeed, your mistake stems from this conflation.

Takfir (declaring someone a disbeliever) is a legal ruling. This man has not received this legal ruling, just as if he were to say that drinking alcohol is permissible—would he be declared a disbeliever? Certainly not, because the religious ordinances have not reached him, and he is excused

on this basis. So why do you excuse someone who deems alcohol permissible, but do not excuse someone who does not declare a polytheist a disbeliever, while both are legal rulings like any other?

The matter becomes even clearer if this man, who is newly converted to Islam, were to say that your actions and polytheism are correct, or if he did not reject polytheism. In this case, he would indeed be a disbeliever because he did not disbelieve in the false deity, did not understand monotheism, and did not reject polytheism—in fact, he has not even entered Islam.

When the Hazimis and their followers fell into gross confusion and significant ignorance, conflating disbelief and takfir, as well as the fundamentals of religion with the fundamentals of ordinances, and the clear issues with the subtle ones, they declared Muslims disbelievers and deemed their blood lawful—may Allah protect us.

To conclude this section, I will quote an important statement I found online, authored by someone who identified himself as "Al-Qami’":

"It is necessary to differentiate between polytheism and the clear ordinances. A Muslim who denies a clear ordinance, yet is newly converted to Islam, or was raised in a non-Muslim country, or lives in a distant desert, is excused due to ignorance and is not deemed an apostate because the ordinances are not binding until they are conveyed. However, if he engages in polytheism and falls into one of its forms while still holding to the foundation of faith, he is subject to the rulings of polytheism and apostasy. However, he is not subject to the rulings of being killed or punished for disbelief until the evidence has been established against him."

Footnote

(2) Here is the link to this topic, which is very important and beneficial. It is one of the best I have read on the concept of excusing ignorance: Principles on Excusing Ignorance
http://cutt.us/hcXGJ

-

-

الأصل الثاني في موافقتهم للمعتزلة :-

ثم ننتقل بعد ذلك الى موافقه العاذرية الحازمية المعتزلة لأسلافهم في إلتزام باطلهم وفساد بدعتهم الشنعاء

فقد نقل الاشعري في مقالات الإسلاميين :

(وحكى محمد بن شبيب وعباد بن سليمان عن أبي شمر أنه كان يقول ان الإيمان هو المعرفة بالله والإقرار به وبما جاء به من عنده ومعرفة العدل يعني قوله في القدر ماكان من ذلك منصوصاً عليه او مستخرجاً بالعقول مما فيه اثبات عدل الله ونفي التشبيه والتوحيد وكل ذلك إيمان والعلم به إيمان والشاك فيه كافر والشاك في الشاك كافر أبداً ، والمعرفة لا يقولون إنها إيمان مالم تضم الإقرار وإذا وقعا كانا جميعاً إيماناً).

وذكر عبدالقادر البغدادي في الفرق بين الفرق (وزعم المردار أيضاً أن من أجاز رؤية الله تعالى بالأبصار بلا كيف فهو كافر والشاك في كفره كافر وكذلك الشاك في الشاك لا إلى نهاية) .

قال أبو الحسين الملطي رحمه الله في التنبيه والرد على أهل الأهواء والبدع :

(فأما الذي يكفر فيه معتزلة بغداد معتزلة البصره فالقول في الشاك والشاك في الشاك ومعنى ذلك أن معتزلة بغداد والبصره وجميع أهل القبله لا اختلاف بينهم أن من شك في كافر فهو كافر لأن الشاك في الكفر لا أيمان له لأنه لا يعرف كفراً من إيمان فليس بين الأمة كلها المعتزله ومن دونهم خلاف أن الشاك في الكافر كافر ثم زاد معتزلة بغداد على معتزلة البصره أن الشاك في الشاك والشاك في الشاك إلى الأبد إلى مالا نهاية له كلهم كفار وسبيلهم سبيل الشاك الأول وقال معتزلة البصره الشاك الأول كافر لانه شك في الكفر والشاك الثاني الذي هو شاك في الشك ليس بكافر بل هو فاسق لأنه لم يشك في الكفر إنما شك في هذا الشاك أيكفر بشكه أم لا فليس سبيله في الكفر سبيل الشاك الأول وكذلك عندهم الشاك في الشاك والشاك في الشاك إلى ما لا نهاية له كلهم فساق إلا الشاك الأول فإنه كافر وقولهم أحسن من قول أهل بغداد)

The Second Principle: Their Agreement with the Mu'tazila

We now move on to discussing how the **Adhiriyyatul Hazimiyyah** align with the Mu'tazila in adopting their falsehoods and adhering to the corruption of their disgraceful innovation.

Al-Ash’ari, in *Maqalat Al-Islamiyyin*, documents:

> "Muhammad ibn Shabeeb and ‘Abbad ibn Sulayman narrated from Abu Shamir that he said: Faith is the recognition of Allah, acknowledgment of Him, and belief in what has come from Him. This includes understanding justice—referring to their stance on predestination (Qadr)—whether deduced rationally or transmitted through proofs, affirming Allah’s justice, negating anthropomorphism, and affirming His oneness. All of this constitutes faith. Knowing it is faith, doubting it is disbelief, and doubting the

> doubter is perpetual disbelief. Recognition alone is not considered faith unless accompanied by acknowledgment, and if both occur, together they constitute faith."

Additionally, Abdul Qadir Al-Baghdadi, in *Al-Farq Bayn Al-Firaq*, stated:

> “Al-Mirdar also claimed that whoever permits the vision of Allah with the eyes in a manner beyond comprehension is a disbeliever, and whoever doubts their disbelief is also a disbeliever, as is the one who doubts the doubter, without end.”

Abu Al-Husayn Al-Malti, in *Al-Tanbih Wal-Radd Ala Ahl Al-Ahwa' Wal-Bida'*, remarked:

> "As for what the Mu'tazila of Baghdad and Basra agree on regarding takfir (declaring disbelievers), it relates to the issue of doubting and doubting the doubter.
>
> This means that the Mu'tazila of Baghdad and Basra—and all the people of Qibla (those who profess Islam)—unanimously agree that anyone who doubts a disbeliever is himself a disbeliever, because the doubter in disbelief has no faith. This is because they cannot distinguish between disbelief and faith. Thus, there is no difference among the Mu'tazila, or between them and others, on this principle: that the doubter in a disbeliever is a disbeliever.
>
> However, the Mu'tazila of Baghdad exceeded the Mu'tazila of Basra by claiming that the doubter in the doubter and the doubter in the doubter endlessly, without limit, are all disbelievers, following the same ruling as the original doubter. The Mu'tazila of Basra, on the other hand, argued that the original doubter is a disbeliever because they doubted disbelief. But the second doubter—who doubts whether the first doubter has disbelieved—is not a disbeliever but a transgressor. This is because they did not doubt disbelief itself but rather doubted whether the first doubter becomes a disbeliever due to their doubt.
>
> Therefore, according to the Mu'tazila of Basra, all subsequent doubters (in the second doubter, third doubter, and so on endlessly) are merely transgressors, except for the original doubter, who is a disbeliever. Their stance is more reasonable than that of the Mu'tazila of Baghdad."

والمعتزلة المعاصرة الحازمية جعلوا تكفير العاذر وتكفير من لم يكفر العاذر أصل من أصول الدين لا يعذر المرء بجهله .ومن توقف أو شك في كفره فهو كافر

وهذه السمة أي تكفير العاذر الأول والعاذر الثاني والإلتزام بالتسلسل متفاوتون بينهم فمقلٌ ومستكثر .

ومنهم من يصدح ويعلن كالخوارج ومنهم من هو جبان منافق أو يعمل بتقية الروافض أو مُدعٍ سياسة شرعية .

علماً بأن الحازمي كان يكفر العاذر الأول فقط موافقاً لمعتزلة البصرة ثم كعادته وتلونه وتمرحله كفر من لم يكفر العاذر "**العاذر الثاني**" فهو الأن في منزلة بين منزلتين بين معتزلة البصرة ومعتزلة بغداد.

ومن يكفر الثالث قطعا أنه يكفر شيخه الحازمي لأنه يكفر الثاني وهكذا فهم على نهج أسلافهم حذو القذة بالقذة المعتزلة الاوائل.

فقد كفروا أبا الحسين البصري وهو من أئمتهم وتكفيرهم أبا الهذيل العلاف وتكفير أبي هاشم الجبائي أباه علي ، وهؤلاء أئمتهم وكبارهم.

ومن المعاصرين :

- المهتدي بالله الابراهيمي يُكفر ضياء الدين القدسي ومن هو دونه ، بسبب خلافهم في اعذار الشاك في بعض قدرة الله عزوجل .

- ضياء الدين القدسي وابو عبدالله المصري وشاكر نعم الله يُكفرون ابا مريم الكويتي ومن هو دونه ، بسبب خلافهم في تحديد أصل الدين .

- المنتصر بالله الشرقاوي والقدسي وشاكر نعم الله يُكفرون ابا عبدالله المصري ومن هو دونه ، بسبب خلافهم في مسائل الايمان والكفر .

-

*The **contemporary Mu'tazila Hazimi sect** has made the takfir (declaring disbelief) of the excuser and the one who does not declare disbelief in the excuser a fundamental principle of the religion, where a person is not excused for ignorance. Whoever hesitates or doubts in declaring them disbelievers is also considered a disbeliever.*

This characteristic—of declaring the first excuser, the second excuser, and so on as disbelievers in a sequential manner—varies among them, with some adhering to it strictly and others less so.

Some of them openly and boldly announce it, like the Khawarij, while others are cowardly, hypocritical, practice *taqiyya* (concealment) like the Rafidah, or falsely claim it as a matter of "Sharia-based politics."

It is worth noting that Hazimi initially only declared the **first excuser** a disbeliever, aligning himself with the Mu'tazila of Basra. However, as is typical of his inconsistency, gradualism, and shifting stances, he later declared the one who does not declare the excuser a disbeliever—the so-called **second excuser**. Thus, Hazimi now occupies a position between the Mu'tazila of Basra and the Mu'tazila of Baghdad.

Logically, those who declare a **third excuser** a disbeliever will inevitably declare their own teacher, Hazimi, a disbeliever, because he declares only the second excuser a disbeliever. This shows that they follow the same path as their predecessors, step by step, just like the early Mu'tazila.

For example, the Mu'tazila declared some of their own prominent leaders as disbelievers:

- They declared **Abu Al-Husayn Al-Basri** a disbeliever, despite him being one of their scholars.
- They also declared **Abu Al-Hudhayl Al-Allaf** and **Abu Hashim Al-Jubba'i** as disbelievers, even Abu Hashim's own father, Ali Al-Jubba'i. These were their imams and leading figures.

Among contemporaries today:

- **Al-Muhtadi Billah Al-Ibrahimi** declares **Diyaa Al-Din Al-Qudsi** and others beneath him as disbelievers due to disagreements over excusing someone who doubts certain aspects of Allah's ability.
- **Diyaa Al-Din Al-Qudsi, Abu Abdullah Al-Masri, and Shakir Ni'amatullah** declare **Abu Maryam Al-Kuwaiti** and others beneath him as disbelievers because of disagreements regarding defining the foundations of the religion.
- **Al-Muntasir Billah Al-Sharqawi, Al-Qudsi, and Shakir Ni'amatullah** declare **Abu Abdullah Al-Masri** and others beneath him as disbelievers due to disputes over issues of faith (*iman*) and disbelief (*kufr*).

-

-

فهذا حال أهل البدع يبتدعون أقوالاً ويكفرون من خالفهم فيها كما قال ابن تيمية رحمه الله في منهاج السنة ٥/ ٩٥ [-- ولكن من شأن أهل البدع أنهم يبتدعون أقوالاً يجعلونها واجبةً في الدين بل يجعلونها من الإيمان الذي لابد منه ويكفرون من خالفهم فيها ، ويستحلون دمه كفعل الخوارج والجهمية والرافضة والمعتزلة وغيرهم وأهل السنه لا يبتدعون قولاً ولا يكفرون من اجتهد فأخطأ وإن كان مخالفاً لهم مستحلاً لدمائهم كما لم تكفر الصحابة الخوارج مع تكفيرهم لعثمان وعلي ومن والاهما واستحلالهم لدماء المسلمين المخالفين لهم --].

تحذير وتنبيه :-

فالحازمي له كلام يدعو للريبة والحذر فقد قال في نهاية الدرس الرابع لشرحه أصل الدين وقاعدته ...{ الكلام واضح كله مكرر من أجل أن نقرر هذا الأصل العظيم ، لئلا يقال أن هذه دعوة وهابية ، **وهذا رأي شيخ الإسلام محمد بن عبدالوهاب وأحفاده وهؤلاء فقط أئمة الدعوة يرون كفر عباد القبور.**

وأما المسألة لو رجعت للكتاب والسنة لرأيت قولا اخرا لو رجعنا للكتاب والسنة لرأينا كفرك الصريح الذي لا نزاع في كفر من لم يكفرك، هذا الذي نعتقده وندين الله تعالى به }.

لاحظ هنا أيها القارئ الكريم ماذا يقول الحازمي : يقول " شيخ الإسلام محمد بن عبدالوهاب وأحفاده وهؤلاء **فقط أئمة الدعوة يرون كفر عباد القبور**" وأئمة الدعوة لا يكفرون العاذر المنتسب للإسلام ابتداء حتى يعرف ويبين ومن يحتج بكلامهم أنهم يكفرون العاذر من قبل التبيين والتعريف فإنما أخذ بمتشابه أقوالهم مع تركه لمحكم أقوالهم وهذا حال أهل البدع ، فهل ياترى الحازمي يكفر أئمة الدعوة ؟

ومن تتبع دروس الحازمي ويرى تدرجه وتمرحله في دعوته يعلم أن الرجل يخبئ بعض معتقده .

This is the condition of the ***people of innovation****—they invent doctrines and declare anyone who opposes them to be a disbeliever. As* ***Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah have mercy on him)*** *said in Minhaj al-Sunnah (5/95):*

> "It is the nature of the people of innovation to invent doctrines that they make obligatory in the religion, even claiming that they are essential aspects of faith. They declare those who oppose them as disbelievers and make their blood permissible, as is the case with the Khawarij, Jahmiyyah, Rafidah, Mu'tazilah, and others. The people of the Sunnah do not invent doctrines, nor do they declare as disbelievers those who exert effort in *ijtihad* (juristic reasoning) and err, even if such people oppose them and consider their blood lawful. The Companions, for instance, did not declare the Khawarij disbelievers, despite the Khawarij's takfir of Uthman, Ali, and those who supported them, and their justification for shedding the blood of Muslims who opposed them."

A warning and clarification:
Hazimi has made statements that raise suspicion and warrant caution. At the conclusion of the fourth lesson of his explanation of *Asl al-Din* (The Foundation of Religion), he said:

> *"The matter is clear and repeatedly emphasized so we can establish this great principle. This is so that no one claims that this is a Wahhabi call or just the opinion of Shaykh al-Islam Muhammad ibn Abdulwahhab, his descendants, or the Imams of the Dawah, who alone see the disbelief of grave worshippers. But if we refer back to the Book and the Sunnah, we would see another opinion!! If we refer back to the Book and the Sunnah, we would see your explicit disbelief—there is no dispute that those who do not declare you a disbeliever are themselves disbelievers. This is what we believe and regard as the religion of Allah, the Exalted."*

Here, dear reader, notice what Hazimi is saying. He states, *"Shaykh al-Islam Muhammad ibn Abdulwahhab, his descendants, and the Imams of the Dawah alone see the disbelief of grave worshippers."* However, the Imams of the Dawah do not declare as disbelievers someone who is affiliated with Islam and provides an excuse (i.e., is ignorant) until knowledge is presented to them and matters are clarified. Those who use their statements to argue that the Imams of the Dawah declare such excusers disbelievers without clarification are, in fact, holding onto ambiguous parts of their words while neglecting their clear and decisive statements. This is the hallmark of the people of innovation.

So, does Hazimi, perhaps, consider the **Imams of the Dawah** disbelievers?

His Belief:
Whoever carefully follows Hazimi's lessons and observes his gradual approach and progression in his call will realize that the man is hiding some things

-

تناقضات العاذرية الحازمية والزامات :-

اسمع ما يقول الحازمي في الدقيقة ٥٥.٣٠ الخامسة والخمسين في أخر رابط في رده على الفتوى التونسية قال بعد سؤال وجه إليه :-

[....من الكفر ما هو مجمع عليه، ومن الكفر ما هو مختلفٌ عليه، تارك الصلاة مجمع عليه، عند كثير من العلماء مختلف فيه، حينئذ إذا رجح زيدٌ من الناس أن تارك الصلاة كافر، ورجح عمرٌو أنه ليس بكافر، حينئذ هل يصح لهذا أن نقول: من لم يكفر تارك الصلاة فهو كافر؟ هل يصح؟ لا يصح بالإجماع.

حينئذ هو في نفسه إذا ظهر له وتحقق أن زيدًا من الناس لا يصلي مطلقًا، وهو رجح أن أو دل الدليل عنده أن من لم يصلي فهو كافر هو في نفسه إذا لم يكفره صار مكذبًا للنص، فيكون ماذا؟ يكون كافرًا. لكن لا يتعدى الحكم إلى غيره، ولذلك هذه المسائل: من لم يكفر المشركين فهو كافر، من لم يكفر الكفار فهو كافر، هذه مسائل مجمع عليها، معلومة من الدين بالضرورة؛ وحينئذ ما لم يكن مجمعًا عليه يُنظر في كل ناقضٍ بحسبه، ولا يتعدى الحكم ألبتة، **ولا يستلزم التسلسل** كذلك].

طبعا الحازمي هنا يقرر أن تارك الصلاة مجمع على كفره وهذا حق ، ثم يقول أنه حصل خلاف.

وأيضا نحن نقرر والحازمي أن من تلبس بالشرك جاهلا فإنه مشرك ولا نعذره بجهله وهذا مجمع عليه لا خلاف فيه، ثم نقول نحن والحازمي أيضا أنه حصل خلاف بعد ذلك.

ثم بعد ذلك التقرير نسأل سؤالين :

هل يعتد بأي خلاف بعد إجماع الصحابة ؟ قطعا لا .

هل يكفر كل من خالف إجماع الصحابة ابتداء إذا لم تكن المسألة ظاهرة بين الناس ؟ قطعا لا .

فلماذا فرق الحازمي هنا بين تكفير تارك الصلاة وبين تكفير العاذر ؟

Contradictions of Al-Hazmiyyah Regarding Excusing Ignorance: Observations and Questions

Listen to what Al-Hazmi says at minute 55:30 in his response to the Tunisian fatwa. After being asked a question, he stated:

> "...There is some kufr (disbelief) that is agreed upon, and there is some kufr over which there is disagreement. The ruling on the one who abandons prayer is agreed upon by many scholars, yet also disputed by others. Thus, if one person (Zayd) concludes that abandoning prayer constitutes kufr, while another (Amr) holds that it does not, can we then say that anyone who does not declare the one abandoning prayer as a disbeliever is himself a disbeliever? Can this ruling be made? It cannot, by consensus.
>
> Therefore, if someone sees and firmly believes that Zayd does not pray at all and is convinced—based on the evidence he has—that anyone who does not pray is a disbeliever, but then fails to declare Zayd as such, he has contradicted the text (of the

> evidence) and thus becomes a disbeliever. However, this judgment does not extend to others. For this reason, such rulings—like 'whoever does not declare the mushrikeen (polytheists) as disbelievers is himself a disbeliever' or 'whoever does not declare disbelievers as such is a disbeliever'—are agreed upon and are known matters of religion by necessity.
>
> Therefore, for cases where there is no consensus, each nullifier (of Islam) must be examined individually, and the ruling cannot extend beyond the person involved. Nor does this necessitate a chain of takfir (declaring disbelief)."

Al-Hazmi here states that the ruling of kufr for abandoning prayer is agreed upon, which is correct. However, he then acknowledges that there is also some disagreement on the matter.

Likewise, we and Al-Hazmi agree that anyone who engages in shirk (polytheism), even out of ignorance, is a mushrik (polytheist), and they are not excused for their ignorance. This, too, is a matter of consensus without dispute. Yet, we also recognize that disagreements on this matter have arisen afterward.

Building on this foundation, we pose two questions:

1. Does any disagreement that arises after the consensus of the Companions hold any weight?
    - Absolutely not.
2. Does everyone who opposes the consensus of the Companions immediately become a disbeliever, particularly if the issue is not clearly understood among people?
    - Certainly not.

So why does Al-Hazmi distinguish between declaring the one who abandons prayer as a disbeliever and declaring the one who excuses a mushrik as a disbeliever?

لماذا عذر الأول ولم يعذر الثاني ؟ وكلاهما حكمان شرعيان ومناط كفرهما واحد وهو تكذيب النص **بل أن حكم تارك الصلاة ظهور كفره ووضوحه أظهر من حكم تكفير العاذر بكثير خاصة في الجزيرة .**

فمن باب الأولى أن يعذر الثاني قبل الأول وذلك لخفاء هذه عن تلك.

وهنا سؤال ثالث للحازمي وأتباعه :

من صح عنده إجماع الصحابة على كفر تارك الصلاة ، فهل يلزمه تكفير كل من لم يكفر التارك ؟

-

Why did he excuse the first but not the second? Both are legal (Shar'i) rulings, and the basis for their disbelief is the same—denial of the text. In fact, the ruling on the one who abandons prayer is far clearer and more evident than the ruling on declaring the excuser as a disbeliever, especially in the Arabian Peninsula.

It would be more appropriate to excuse the second before excusing the first, due to the greater obscurity of the second issue compared to the first.

Here is a third question for Al-Hazmi and his followers:
If someone is convinced of the consensus of the Companions regarding the disbelief of the one who abandons prayer, is it then obligatory for him to declare as a disbeliever everyone who does not declare the one who abandons prayer a disbeliever?

-

An

حوار مهم :-

هذا حوارافتراضي على كلام الحازمي أعلاه بين بدعتين بين بدعة العاذر بالجهل وبين من يكفر العاذر بين مرجئ وبين معتزلي حروري : -

قال الشيخ الحازمي : " تارك الصلاة مجمع عليه، عند كثير من العلماء مختلف فيه"

قال العاذر بالجهل في الشرك الأكبر أيضا : " تكفير الجاهل المنتسب للإسلام مجمع عليه عند كثير من العلماء مختلف فيه"

قال الحازمي : " حينئذ إذا رجح زيدٌ من الناس أن تارك الصلاة كافر، ورجح عمرٌو أنه ليس بكافر، حينئذ هل يصح لهذا أن نقول: من لم يكفر تارك الصلاة فهو كافر؟ هل يصح؟ لا يصح بالإجماع "

ثم قال العاذر ونحن أيضا نقول : " حينئذ إذا رجح زيدٌ من الناس أن المتلبس بالشرك جاهلا أنه كافر ، ورجح عمرٌو أنه ليس بكافر، حينئذ هل يصح لهذا أن نقول: من لم يكفر المتلبس بالشرك جاهلا أنه كافر؟ هل يصح؟ لا يصح بالإجماع "

ثم قال الحازمي : " حينئذ هو في نفسه إذا ظهر له وتحقق أن زيدًا من الناس لا يصلي مطلقًا، وهو رجح أن أو دل الدليل عنده أن من لم يصلي فهو كافر هو في نفسه إذا لم يكفره صار مكذبًا للنص، فيكون ماذا؟ يكون كافرًا. لكن لا يتعدى الحكم إلى غيره "

فقال العاذر ونحن أيضا نقول : "حينئذ هو في نفسه إذا ظهر له وتحقق أن زيدا من الناس أنه تلبس بالشرك جاهلا ، وهو رجح أن أو دل الدليل عنده أن من تلبس بالشرك فهو كافر هو في نفسه إذا لم يكفره صار مكذباً للنص ، فيكون ماذا؟ يكون كافراً . لكن لا يتعدى الحكم إلى غيره"

Important Dialogue:

This is a hypothetical dialogue based on Al-Hazmi's statements above, between two innovations: the innovation of excusing due to ignorance (Al-'Adhir bi Al-Jahl) and the innovation of declaring the excuser as a disbeliever—between an *Irja'* adherent and a *Mu'tazili Haruri*:

Al-Sheikh Al-Hazmi said: *"The abandonment of prayer is agreed upon, yet according to many scholars, it is disputed."*

The one excusing ignorance in *major shirk* responded: *"Declaring the ignorant person affiliated with Islam as a disbeliever is agreed upon, yet according to many scholars, it is also disputed."*

Al-Hazmi said: *"So, if Zaid determines that the one who abandons prayer is a disbeliever, and Amr determines that he is not, is it valid for Zaid to say: 'Whoever does not declare the one who abandons prayer a disbeliever is himself a disbeliever'? Is this valid? It is not valid by consensus."*

Then the one excusing ignorance responded: *"Likewise, we also say: If Zaid determines that someone committing shirk out of ignorance is a disbeliever, and Amr determines that he is not, is it valid for Zaid to say: 'Whoever does not declare the one committing shirk out of ignorance a disbeliever is himself a disbeliever'? Is this valid? It is not valid by consensus."*

Al-Hazmi said: *"So if it becomes clear and certain to him that Zaid does not pray at all, and he determines—based on evidence—that one who does not pray is a disbeliever, but he himself does not declare Zaid as a disbeliever, then what is he? He becomes a denier of the text, and therefore what? He becomes a disbeliever. However, this ruling does not extend to others."*

Then the one excusing ignorance responded: *"Likewise, we also say: If it becomes clear and certain to him that Zaid has committed shirk out of ignorance, and he determines—based on evidence—that one who commits shirk is a disbeliever, but he himself does not declare Zaid as a disbeliever, then what is he? He becomes a denier of the text, and therefore what? He becomes a disbeliever. However, this ruling does not extend to others."*

-

-

Then the excuser said:

ثم قال العاذر : "من لم يكفر المشركين فهو كافر، من لم يكفر الكفار فهو كافر، هذه مسائل مجمع عليها، معلومة من الدين بالضرورة؛ وحينئذ ما لم يكن مجمعًا عليه يُنظر في كل ناقضٍ بحسبه "

ثم ختم العاذر فقال : " فأنت ياالحازمي ومن تبعك كفار مرتدون خاصة أنتم أبناء الجزيرة لأن كفر تارك الصلاة عندكم مجمع عليه وهذه المسألة يعلمها العامة والخاصة عندكم "

ومناط كفركم عندنا :

أولا: أنكم كذبتم النص وكفر تارك الصلاة من المسائل الظاهرة التي يعلمها الخاص والعام.

ثانيا: أنكم جعلتم الكفر إيمانا .

ثالثا :أنكم لم تتبرؤوا من الكفار .

رابعا: أنكم واليتم الكفار .

خامسا :أنكم جوزتم اجتماع الإيمان والكفر في قلب المسلم.

إلى غير ذلك من الإلزامات التي نلزمكم بها ونكفركم عليها وإن لم تلتزموا بها كما ألزمتمونا بها لم نلتزم وكفرتمونا عليها.

"Whoever does not declare the polytheists as disbelievers is a disbeliever; whoever does not declare the disbelievers as disbelievers is a disbeliever. These are matters that are agreed upon and known from the religion by necessity. Therefore, anything that is not agreed upon should be considered based on its individual contradictions."

Then the excuser concluded:
"So, you, Al-Hazmi, and those who follow you are disbelievers and apostates, especially you, the people of the Arabian Peninsula, because the disbelief of the one who abandons prayer is agreed upon by you, and this matter is known by both the general public and the scholars among you."

*"The basis of your disbelief, according to us, is:

1. You have denied the text, and declaring the one who abandons prayer as a disbeliever is one of the clear issues known by both the common and the learned.
2. You have made disbelief into faith.
3. You have not disassociated yourselves from the disbelievers.
4. You have aligned yourselves with the disbelievers.
5. You have allowed the combination of faith and disbelief in the heart of a Muslim."*

There are other obligations that we hold against you and for which we declare you disbelievers, even if you do not adhere to them, just as you have imposed obligations on us that we did not accept and declared us disbelievers for not adhering to them.

-

Does Al-

هل الحازمي يقول بالتسلسل ؟

في كلام الحازمي أعلاه أصل في هذه المسألة وفصل فقال : " ماهو مجمع عليه وما ليس بمجمع عليه . ما لم يكن مجمعًا عليه يُنظر في كل ناقضٍ بحسبه، ولا يتعدى الحكم ألبتة، ولا يستلزم التسلسل كذلك".

قال : في ما ليس بمجمع عليه لا يلزم التسلسل **هنا**

وأما ماكان مجمع عليه كقوله :" من لم يكفر المشركين فهو كافر، من لم يكفر الكفار فهو كافر، هذه مسائل مجمع عليها، معلومة من الدين بالضرورة" .

فهذا صريح كلامه **أن ماهو مجمع عليه يلزم التسلسل** ، خاصة وأنه صرح أنه يكفر العاذر الثاني والثالث ، فمن كفر العاذر الثاني والثالث مالذي يمنعه أن يكفر العاشر إلى الألف إلى مالا نهاية ، ففي الحالة هذه يكون الحازمي وكما هي عادته في تمرحله قد انتقل من تبديعه العاذر في بادئ أمره إلى تكفير العاذر الأول كحال معتزلة البصرة ثم إلى تكفيره العاذر الثاني "المنزلة بين المنزلتين" ثم انتقل في أخر أمره بالتسلسل كحال معتزلة بغداد .

فقد بلغنا عن إخواننا الثقات في الجزيرة أن من خواص طلاب الحازمي منهم من يكفر العاذر الرابع ومنهم يزيد ومنهم التزم التسلسل ، وهؤلاء من خواصّه ، فقطعا أن الحازمي يعلم قولهم ، فهل هؤلاء قد خالفوا شيخهم أم أنهم مقلدون له ؟

نريد من الحازمي أن يكون شجاعا ويظهر ما يخبئه من معتقد، فإننا قد عرفنا منهج الحدادية **في التدرج الماكر على طريقة الباطنية** و **تلونهم والتدرج في ترويج بدعتهم** .

كثير من الأخوة في الجزيرة ينقل عنك "**أنك ترى أن الأصل في الناس الكفر**" وكنا نحسن فيك الظن ثم أنكرت ذلك وأخرجت فتاوى تكذب ذلك ، فما عذرك عن صريح قولك هذا في التسلسل؟ .

فما عاد لإحسان الظن مقعد سيما وقد ظهر منك أفعالك الكفرية والردة على أصلك الفاسد .

Hazmi believe in the chain of takfir?

In Al-Hazmi's statement above, he establishes a principle in this matter and explains it, saying: *"What is agreed upon and what is not agreed upon. What is not agreed upon should be examined individually, based on each contradiction, and the ruling should not extend beyond that, nor should it necessitate a chain of takfir."* He says that in matters not agreed upon, the chain of takfir is not required.

As for matters that are agreed upon, like his statement: *"Whoever does not declare the polytheists as disbelievers is a disbeliever; whoever does not declare the disbelievers as disbelievers is a disbeliever. These are matters that are agreed upon and known from the religion by necessity."*

This is a clear statement from him that in matters that are agreed upon, the chain of takfir is necessary. Especially since he explicitly stated that he considers the second and third excusers as disbelievers. So, if someone considers the second and third excusers as disbelievers, what would stop them from declaring the tenth, the thousandth, and so on as disbelievers? In this case, Al-Hazmi, as is his custom in his gradual approach, has moved from declaring the excuser as misguided in the beginning to declaring the first excuser as a disbeliever, like the stance of the Basra Mu'tazilites. Then, he moved to declaring the second excuser as a disbeliever, placing them in an ambiguous position, and eventually reached a position of endless chain of takfir, similar to the position of the Baghdad Mu'tazilites.

We have been informed by our trustworthy brothers in the Arabian Peninsula that among Al-Hazmi's special students, some declare the fourth excuser as a disbeliever, others go even further, and some adhere to the chain of takfir. These are his special followers, and it is certain that Al-Hazmi is aware of their opinions. So, have they contradicted their teacher, or are they simply following him?

We want Al-Hazmi to be brave and reveal what he hides in his beliefs. We have already recognized the methodology of the Haddaadiyyah in their deceptive gradual approach, similar to that of the Batiniyyah, and their progress in spreading their heresy.

Many brothers in the Arabian Peninsula report that you believe the default stance regarding people is disbelief. We had a good opinion of you at first, but then you denied it and issued fatwas that contradicted this. What is your excuse for your explicit statement in support of the chain of takfir?

There is no longer room for good assumptions, especially since your actions of disbelief and apostasy have become clear according to your original stance.

إن من يكفر العاذر الأول والعاذر الثاني كما قال في نهاية الدرس الرابع لشرحه أصل الدين وقاعدته ...{ الكلام واضح كله مكرر من أجل أن نقرر هذا الأصل العظيم ، لئلا يقال أن هذه دعوة وهابية ، وهذا رأي شيخ الإسلام محمد بن عبدالوهاب وأحفاده وهؤلاء فقط أئمة الدعوة يرون كفر عباد القبور. وأما المسألة لو رجعت للكتاب والسنة لرأيت قولا اخر!! لو رجعنا للكتاب والسنة لرأينا كفرك الصريح الذي لا نزاع في كفر من لم يكفرك، هذا الذي نعتقده وندين الله تعالى به } .

إن من يكفر العاذر الأول والعاذر الثاني يلزمه قطعا التسلسل في التكفير فكيف بمن صرح بالتسلسل في الكفر المجمع عليه ؟

ومن نظر بتجرد في واقع القوم يعلم يقينا أن هناك تلازم في الواقع **بين التسلسل وبين الأصل في الناس الكفر** ، فكما ذكرنا من قبل أن كل من على البسيطة لا يكفرون العاذر ابتداء وكل مولود قد ولد من أبوين لا يكفران العاذر فالنتيجة واضحة لكل عاقل عند القوم **"أن الأصل في الناس الكفر"** لأنهم لم يكفروا العاذر ولم يكفروا بالطاغوت ولم يعرفوا التوحيد.

فكثير من أتباعه اغتر بتمكنه من علم الألة **ونقولاته لأئمة الدعوة** فظن أنه العالم المبجل ولم يعلم أن أكثر علماء الأصول معتزلة وأشعرية فهل يؤخذ منهم التوحيد والعقيدة ؟ .

Whoever declares the first and second excusers as disbelievers, as he stated at the end of the fourth lesson of his explanation of the foundation of the religion and its principles, said: ***"The statement is clear and repeated in order to establish this great principle, so that it is not said that this is a Wahhabi call, and this is the opinion of Sheikh al-Islam Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab and his descendants, and only these Imams of the call consider the worshipers of graves to be disbelievers. As for the issue, if you refer to the Qur'an and the Sunnah, you would see another opinion! If we refer to the Qur'an and Sunnah, we would see the clear disbelief of anyone who***

does not consider you a disbeliever. This is what we believe and what we declare our faith in to Allah, the Almighty.”

Whoever declares the first and second excusers as disbelievers must inevitably believe in a chain of takfir, so how can one who has explicitly stated the chain of takfir in matters of clear consensus on disbelief be any different?

If one looks at the situation of the people with an unbiased view, they will know for sure that there is a direct connection between the chain of takfir and the fundamental belief that the default status of people is disbelief. As we mentioned before, no one in the world initially declares the excuser a disbeliever, and every newborn born to parents who do not declare the excuser a disbeliever, the result is clear to every reasonable person among the group: *"The default status of people is disbelief,"* because they have not declared the excuser as a disbeliever, nor have they declared disbelief in the Taghut, nor have they known Tawhid.

Many of his followers were deceived by his proficiency in the tools of knowledge and his quotations from the Imams of the call, thinking that he is the esteemed scholar. However, they did not realize that most of the scholars of usul (principles of Islamic jurisprudence) are Mu'tazila and Ash'ari. So, can we take from them the true understanding of Tawhid and creed?

-

-

And how

❖ **وما أجمل كلام قرأته لأحد الأخوة :**

(بين الحازمي وابن تومرت)

تذكرت اليوم ابن تومرت ومن لايعرف ابن تومرت فهو من أهل الضلال في العقيدة لكنه كان طويل الباع في علم الفلسفة والمنطق والجدل وكان بليغاً ذكياً مخادعاً فقدم على دولة المرابطين بعد قيامها واستتباب الأمور فيها وكان شيوخ المرابطين أهل توحيد و صدق عرفوا العقيدة بأدلتها وعضوا عليها بالنواجد وتمسكوا فيها ففتح الله عليهم بها الأمصار فهم على طريقة السلف أهل الأثر فأستقل ابن تومرت ذلك فكان في كل نقاش مع أحد شيوخ المرابطين يحيد عن الموضوع ويتكثر بما يعرف من علم الجدل والفلسفة ويطيل الكلام حتى يشرد ذهن المتلقي ويتيه عن أصل الخلاف ولايميز بين ماعند المرابطين من المحكم وماعنده من المتشابه فيعجب فيه العوام حتى فتنهم عن دينهم فأتبعوه فأرداهم في المهالك والضلال العظيم والعياذ بالله

ذكرت ابن تومرت وأنا استمع لكلام الحازمي في رده على الشيخ تركي البنعلي فالخلاف معروف أين يصل فلا حاجة لكل هذا التكثر بالكلام وعلم الجدل وغير ذلك فمحل النزاع هل ائمة السلف عند تنزيل هذه العمومات على المعين هل يعتبرونها من المسائل الظاهرة أو الخفية ، والإجماع القطعي على خلاف ماذهب إليه فالحازمي هو المطالب بمثال واحد يثبت ماذهب إليه ولم يستطع إثبات ذلك.

أما سؤال البنعلي فهو سؤال مشروع ولا وجه لانتقاد الحازمي له لثلاثة أمور: -

١/ أن النصوص أخبرتنا أن الأمة لاتجتمع على باطل وقد أجمعت على خلاف كلامك كما نقل ابن سحمان فأنت مطالب بخرم هذا الإجماع لدفع الباطل عنك

٢/ اخبرتنا النصوص ان الطائفة المنصورة موجودة على مر الأزمان وأن الحق معها فما لم يكن دينا عند هذه الطائفة على مر الأزمان مع وجود الحالات المشابهة فليس بدين اليوم.

beautiful is the statement I read from one of the brothers:

(Between Al-Hazmi and Ibn Tumart)

Today, I remembered Ibn Tumart. And for those who do not know Ibn Tumart, he is from the people of misguidance in creed, but he was skilled in philosophy, logic, and debate. He was eloquent, intelligent, and deceitful. He came to the state of the Almoravids after it was established and stable, and the scholars of the Almoravids were people of pure monotheism (Tawhid) and sincerity. They knew the creed through its proofs and clung to it strongly, and Allah granted them victory in their conquests because they followed the way of the Salaf, the people of Hadith. Ibn Tumart, however,

dismissed this, and whenever he engaged in a debate with one of the scholars of the Almoravids, he would divert the discussion away from the topic and overwhelm them with his knowledge of dialectics, philosophy, and long-winded speeches. He would stretch the conversation to the point where it confused the listener and deviated from the core issue, causing them to lose track of the main disagreement. He blurred the distinction between what the Almoravids held from the clear (muhkam) and what he held as ambiguous (mutashabih), and so the masses were deceived by him and misled from their faith. They followed him, and he led them into destruction and great misguidance, seeking refuge with Allah from that.

I remembered Ibn Tumart while listening to Al-Hazmi's response to Sheikh Turki Al-Bin'ali. The disagreement is well known, so there is no need for all this verbosity and use of dialectical knowledge and other topics. The point of contention is whether the Imams of the Salaf, when applying these general statements to specific cases, consider them to be clear or obscure issues. There is an absolute consensus contrary to what Al-Hazmi has stated. Al-Hazmi is the one who is required to provide a single example to support his claim, but he was unable to do so.

Points:

As for Al-Banali's question, it is a legitimate question, and there is no reason to criticize Al-Hazmi for it, for three reasons:

1. **The texts have informed us** that the Ummah will never unite upon falsehood, and they have unanimously opposed your statement, as transmitted by Ibn Sahman. You are required to refute this consensus in order to remove the falsehood from your position.
2. **The texts have informed us** that the victorious group (al-ta'ifah al-mansurah) will exist throughout time, and that the truth will always be with them. So, what was not considered religion by this group throughout history, even in similar situations, is not considered religion today.

-

٣/ أنه هو من كان يتظاهر أن ائمة الدعوة على معتقده قبل أن ينتشر بين الناس مانقل ابن سحمان من الإجماع القطعي على بطلان تكفير العاذر لشبهة ثم بعد أن أظهر الله هذا الإجماع بدأ يعيب ذكر اقوال ائمة السلف أو السؤال عن رأيهم"أ.هـ.

وأنصح أتباع المعتزلة الجدد بإعتزال الحازمي وأهل الاعتزال وأقول كيف تقلد دينك رجلاً كان جامياً ثم صار حدادياً والحدادية معروف منهجهم خرجوا من رحم الجامية وقد أشتهر عنهم لما كان الحازمي معهم :

- تكفيرهم العاذر.
- مشابهة الروافض في الكذب وتصديق الكذب وتكذيب الصدق.
- التدرج الماكر على طريقة الباطنية.
- الكذب والفجور والتأصيلات الباطلة.
- تلونهم والتدرج في ترويج بدعتهم باسم "السياسة الشرعية".

وارجع ياطالب الحق إلى جدالهم وخصوماتهم التي دارت بينهم وبين الجامية.

كيف تقلد دينك معتزلياً كيف تقلد دينك رجلاً يفعل الرِّده جهاراً " على مذهبه الفاسد " وإن كنا لا نكفره ، ثم يرجع للإسلام ثم يرتد ثم يرجع فقد رأيته في مصر لما قال {...تريد أن تقلد من لا يعذر لا بأس تريد أن تقلد من يعذر لا بأس يعني لا تجعل الموضوع كأنه فيْصل إما إسلام وإما كفر}

فبناءً على أصله الفاسد فقد أعلن ردته هنا إذ أنه لم يكن مكرها ، كما هو معلوم أنه لا يجوز فعل الكفر إلا المكره كما ذكر في رده على البراك ، وهو الحق ، أسألك بالله أمثل هذا يؤخذ العقيدة منه ؟

He is the one who pretended that the Imams of the Da'wah (Reform Movement) shared his belief before the consensus, as conveyed by Ibn Sahman, became widespread among the people regarding the invalidity of declaring the excuse for someone ignorant (the 'adhir) as a disbeliever (kafir) due to a misunderstanding. After this consensus was made clear by Allah, he began to criticize mentioning the sayings of the Imams of the Salaf or asking about their views.

And I advise the new followers of the Mu'tazilah to distance themselves from Al-Hazmi and the people of Mu'tazilism. I ask, how can you follow the religion of a man who was once Jamii (a follower of the Jami'ah) but later became a Hadaadi (a follower of the Hadaadiyya) The

Hadaadiyyah is a well-known movement that emerged from the Jami'ah. It became famous for the following:

- **Declaring the excuser (the 'adhir) as a disbeliever.**
- **Similarities with the Rafidah (Shia) in lying, believing lies, and denying the truth.**
- **Cunning gradualism following the path of the Batiniyyah (esoteric groups).**
- **Lying, depravity, and the false foundation of their beliefs.**
- **Their opportunistic changes and gradual promotion of their innovation under the guise of "Shari'ah Politics."**

Return, O seeker of the truth, to their debates and disputes with the Jami'ah. How can you follow the religion of someone who was once an opponent of it, then openly apostatized according to his corrupt ideology? Even though we do not declare him an apostate, he returned to Islam, then apostatized again, and then returned. I saw him in Egypt when he said: "You want to follow those who do not excuse (ignorance), no problem. You want to follow those who excuse, no problem. But do not make this issue seem like a decisive matter between Islam and disbelief."

Based on his corrupt principles, he declared his apostasy here, as he was not coerced, as it is well known that one can only commit acts of disbelief if they are coerced, as mentioned in his response to Al-Barrak. This is the truth. I ask you by Allah: is it from such a person that you take your creed?

وأيضا لما وجه له سؤالا مفاده : -

ياشيخ هناك من ينسب لك فتوى وهي الرد على فتوى التونسية أنك لا تعذر بالجهل لمن دخل في الانتخابات وإن كان الدخول بقصد محاربة الشرك وأن هذا التأول ليس مستساغ وأن الذين أفتو بالدخول كفار نتمنى منك التوضيح يا شيخ بارك الله فيك

فكان جوابه:-

لا يصح نسبة هذا الفهم إلي ..**بل كان مقصودي في الرد على الفتوى التونسية هو الشرك الأكبر في العبادة** ...وبالله التوفيق.

لاحظ يقول " كان مقصودي في الرد على الفتوى التونسية هو **الشرك الأكبر في العبادة** ."

فعلى كلامه أن الدخول في الإنتخابات ليس من الشرك الأكبر فضلا عن أن يكفر.

فحقيقة هذا القول أنه لم يكفر بالطاغوت بل يعتبر أنه جاهلٌ في التوحيد حيث جعل الشرك توحيداً وبالتالي جعل المشرك مسلماً، ولا أقول أن هذا يلزمك بل هو أصل قولك فنحن لا نتكلم عن العاذر وإنما كلامنا عن المتلبس نفسه فمثله كمثل من يقول " أن دعاء صاحب القبر ليس من الشرك الأكبر" أمثل هذا يؤخذ علم العقيدة منه ؟

-

Also, when he was asked a question that went as follows:

"Sheikh, there are those who attribute to you a fatwa, which is the response to the Tunisian fatwa, that you do not excuse ignorance for those who enter into elections, even if the intention is to fight polytheism. And that this interpretation is not acceptable, and that those who issued fatwas permitting entry into elections are disbelievers. We wish for clarification from you, Sheikh, may Allah bless you."

His response was:

"It is correct to attribute this understanding to me... Rather, my intention in responding to the Tunisian fatwa was regarding major shirk in worship... and success is with Allah."

Notice that he says, "My intention in responding to the Tunisian fatwa was regarding major shirk in worship." According to his statement, entering into elections is not considered major shirk, let alone something that would lead to disbelief. The reality of this statement is that he did not declare

disbelief in the taghut (false gods); rather, he considers the person ignorant in terms of tawhid, as he has made shirk into tawhid and thus regarded the polytheist as a Muslim.

I do not say that this necessarily applies to you, but it is the fundamental principle of your statement. We are not talking about excusing ignorance, but our discussion is about the individual who engages in such actions. "He is like someone who says, 'Calling upon the occupant of the grave is not major shirk.' Can such a person be trusted with matters of aqeedah (creed)?"

- The Method of the Salaf with the People of Innovation:

منهج السلف مع أهل البدع :-

فاعتزال أهل البدع هو نهج سلفنا الصالح رضي عنهم ، فقد روى الدارمي وابن بطة عن الحسن رحمه الله أنه كان يقول :" **لا تجالسوا أهل الأهواء ولا تجادلوهم ولا تسمعوا منهم**".

وقد روى الآجرّي واللالكائي عن الحسن أيضاً أن رجلاً أتاه فقال يا أبا سعيد إني أريد أن أخاصمك فقال الحسن :" إليك عني فإني عرفت ديني وإنما يخاصمك الشاك في دينه"

وعن إسماعيل بن خارجة قال : دخل رجلان من أهل الأهواء على محمد بن سيرين فقالا: يا أبا بكر نحدثك بحديث. قال : لا. قالا :فنقرأ عليك آية من كتاب الله . قال: لا . وقال: تقومان عني وإلا قمت فقام الرجلان فخرجا فقال بعض القوم ما كان عليك أن يقرأا آية ؟ فقال :"إني كرهت أن يقرأ آية فيحرفانها **فيقرّ ذلك في قلبي**".

وروى عبدالله بن الإمام أحمد في السنة عن أبي قلابة رحمه الله قال:" لا تجالسوهم ولا تخالطوهم **فإني لا آمن أن يغمسوكم في ضلالاتهم ويلبسوا عليكم كثيراً مما تعرفون**".

قال سفيان الثوري:(من جالس صاحب بدعة لم يسلم من إحدى ثلاث : إما أن يكون فتنة لغيره ، وإما أن يقع في قلبه شيئ فيزلّ به فيدخله النار ، وإما أن يقول والله ماأبالي ما تكلموا وأنا واثق بنفسي!! فمن أمن الله على دينه طرفة عين سلبه إياه).

وهذا الإمام ابن بطة رحمه الله ختم كتابه [الإبانة الصغرى] بقوله: ((وَمِنْ اَلسُّنَّةِ وَتَمَام اَلْإِيمَانِ وَكَمَالِهِ: اَلْبَرَاءَةُ مِنْ كُلِّ اِسْمٍ خَالَفَ اَلسُّنَّةَ وَخَرَجَ مِنْ إِجْمَاعِ اَلْأُمَّةِ وَمُبَايَنَةُ أَهْلِهِ وَمُجَانَبَةُ مَنِ اِعْتَقَدَهُ وَالتَّقَرُّبُ إِلَى اَللَّهِ عز وجل بِمُخَالِفَتِهِ....إلى أن قال... فَمِنْ رُؤَسَائِهِمْ اَلْمُتَقَدِّمِينَ فِي اَلضَّلَالِ: مِنْهُمْ اَلْجَهْمُ بْنُ صَفْوَانَ اَلضَّالُّ؛ وَقَدْ قِيلَ لَهُ وَهُوَ بِالشَّامِ: أَيْنَ تُرِيدُ؟ فَقَالَ أَطْلُبُ رِبًا أَعْبُدُهُ!، فَتَقَلَّدَ مَقَالَتَهُ طَوَائِفُ مِنْ اَلضُّلَّالِ، وَقَدْ قَالَ اِبْنُ شَوْذَبٍ: تَرَكَ جَهْمٌ اَلصَّلَاةَ أَرْبَعِينَ يَوْمًا عَلَى وَجْهِ اَلشَّكِّ.

The method of the Salaf (righteous predecessors) with the people of innovation is to avoid them. This was the approach of our righteous predecessors, may Allah be pleased with them. Al-Darimi and Ibn Batta narrated from Al-Hasan, may Allah have mercy on him, that he used to say: *"Do not sit with the people of desires, do not argue with them, and do not listen to them."*

Al-Ajuri and Al-Lalakai narrated from Al-Hasan as well that a man came to him and said: *"O Abu Said, I want to argue with you."* Al-Hasan replied: *"Stay away from me, for I know my religion. Only one who doubts his religion argues with you."*

And from Ismail ibn Khairajah, he said: *"Two men from the people of innovation came to Muhammad ibn Sirin and said: 'O Abu Bakr, we want to narrate a hadith to you.' He replied: 'No.' They said: 'We will read you an ayah from the Book of Allah.' He replied: 'No.' He then said: 'Either you leave, or I will leave.' The two men got up and left. Some people said: 'What was wrong with you letting them read an ayah?' He replied: 'I disliked them reading an ayah, for they might misinterpret it and cause confusion in my heart.'"*

Abdullah ibn Imam Ahmad narrated in his book *Al-Sunnah* from Abu Qilabah, may Allah have mercy on him, who said: *"Do not sit with them or mix with them, for I fear they will immerse you in their misguidance and confuse you with much of what you already know."* Sufyan al-Thawri said: *"Whoever sits with the people of innovation will not be safe from one of three things: either he will become a fitnah (trial) for others, or something will enter his heart, causing him to slip and fall into the Hellfire, or he will say: 'I do not care what they say, I am confident in myself.' But whoever feels secure about his religion for even a moment, Allah will take it away from him."*

The Imam Ibn Batta, may Allah have mercy on him, concluded his book *Al-Ibanah al-Sughra* by saying: *"From the Sunnah, and the completion of faith, is the disavowal of every group that opposes the Sunnah and deviates from the consensus of the Ummah, and to distance oneself from its people, avoiding those who hold such beliefs, and to seek closeness to Allah, the Almighty, by opposing them."* He then said: *"Among their leading figures in misguidance was Jahm ibn Safwan, who was asked while in Syria: 'Where do you want to go?' He replied: 'I seek a deity to worship.' His statement was taken up by groups of misguidance. Ibn Shawdhab said: 'Jahm abandoned prayer for forty days due to doubt.'"*

-

The

وَمِنْ أَتْبَاعِهِ وَأَشْيَاعِهِ: بِشْرٌ اَلْمِرِيسِي وَالْمِرْدَارُ وَأَبُو بَكْرٍ اَلْأَصَمُّ وَإِسْمَاعِيلُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ ابْنُ عُلَيَّةَ وَابْنُ أَبِي دُؤَادٍ وَبُرْغُوثُ وَرِبَالُوِيَةُ وَالْأَرْمَنِيُّ وَجَعْفَرٌ اَلْحَذَّاءُ وَشُعَيْبٌ اَلْحَجَّامُ وَحَسَنُ اَلْعَطَّارُ وَسَهْلٌ اَلْحَرَارُ وَأَبُو لُقْمَانَ اَلْكَافِرُ فِي جَمَاعَةٍ سِوَاهُمْ مِنَ اَلضُّلَّالِ، وَكُلُّ اَلْعُلَمَاءِ يَقُولُونَ فِيمَنْ سَمَّيْنَاهُمْ إِنَّهُمْ أَئِمَّةُ اَلْكُفْرِ وَرُؤَسَاءُ اَلضَّلَالَةِ.

وَمِنْ رُؤَسَائِهِمْ أَيْضًا - وَهُمْ أَصْحَابُ اَلْقَدَرِ -: مَعْبَدٌ اَلْجُهَنِيِّ وَغَيْلَانُ اَلْقَدَرِيُّ وَثُمَامَةُ بْنُ أَشْرَسَ وَعَمْرُو بْنُ عُبَيْدٍ وَأَبُو اَلْهُذَيْلِ اَلْعَلَّافُ وَإِبْرَاهِيمُ اَلنَّظَّامِيُّ وَبِشْرُ بْنُ اَلْمُعْتَمِرِ، فِي جَمَاعَةٍ سِوَاهُمْ أَهْلُ كُفْرٍ وَضَلَالٍ يَعُمُّ، وَمِنْهُمْ: اَلْحَسَنُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اَلْوَهَّابِ اَلْجُبَّائِيُّ وَأَبُو اَلْعَنْبَسِ اَلصَّيْمَرِيُّ.

وَمَنْ اَلرَّافِضَةِ: اَلْمُغِيرَةُ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ وَعَبْدُ اَللَّهِ بْنُ سَبَإٍ وَهِشَامٌ اَلْفُوطِيُّ وَأَبُو اَلْكروسِ وَفُضَيْلٌ اَلرَّقَاشِيُّ وَأَبُو مَالِكٍ اَلْحَضْرَمِيُّ وَصَالِحٌ قُبَّةٌ.

بَلْ هُمْ أَكْثَرُ مِنْ أَنْ يُحْصَوْا فِي كِتَابٍ أَوْ يُحْوَوْا بِخِطَابٍ، ذَكَرْتُ طَرَفًا مِنْ أَئِمَّتِهِمْ: لِيَتَجَنَّبَ اَلْحَدَثُ وَمَنْ لَا عِلْمَ لَهُ ذِكْرَهُمْ وَمُجَالَسَةَ مَنْ يَسْتَشْهِدُ بِقَوْلِهِمْ وَيُنَاظِرُ بِكُتُبِهِمْ.

<u>وَمِنْ خُبَثَائِهِمْ وَمَنْ يَظْهَرُ فِي كَلَامِهِ اَلذَّبُّ عَنْ اَلسُّنَّةِ وَالنُّصْرَةُ لَهَا وَقَوْلُهُ أَخْبَثُ اَلْقَوْلِ:</u> اِبْنِ كُلَّابٍ وَحُسَيْنٌ اَلنَّجَّارُ وَأَبُو بَكْرٍ اَلْأَصَمُّ)).

وقال الإمام ابن بطة رحمه الله في -الإبانة الكبرى -: ((...وإنما ذكرتُ هذه الأقوال من مذاهبهم: ليعلم إخواننا ما قد اشتملت عليه مذاهب الجهمية المقبوحة المنبوحة من ألوان الضلال وصنوف الشرك وقبائح الأقوال؛ ليجتنب الحدث ممن لا علم له مجالستهم وصحبتهم وألفتهم، ولا يصغي إلى شيء من أقوالهم وكلامهم)).

فانظر ياطالب الحق إلى تحذير السلف من أهل الأهواء والبدع والزم نهجهم وكما قال ابن مسعود رضي الله عنه (من كان مستناً فليستن بمن قد مات أولئك أصحاب محمد ﷺ كانوا خير هذه الأمة وأبرها قلوبا وأعمقها علما وأقلها تكلفا قوم اختارهم الله لصحبة نبيه صلى الله عليه وسلم ونقل دينه فتشبهوا بأخلاقهم وطرائقهم فهم كانوا على الهدى المستقيم " [شرح السنة للبغوي].

Method of the Salaf with the People of Innovation:

Among his followers and supporters were: Bishr al-Marisi, al-Mardaar, Abu Bakr al-Asamm, Ismail ibn Ibrahim ibn Ulayyah, Ibn Abi Du'ad, Burghuth, Rabalawiya, the Armenian, Ja'far the brother of the Khawaarij, Shu'ayb al-Hajjama, Hasan al-'Attar, Sahl al-Kharrar, and Abu Luqman al-Kafir, among others of misguidance. All the scholars say about those whom we have named that they are the leaders of disbelief and the heads of misguidance.

Among their leaders as well – those who were proponents of the doctrine of Qadar (denial of Divine Will) – are: Ma'bad al-Juhani, Ghaylan al-Qadari, Tamamah ibn Ashras, Amr ibn Ubaid, Abu al-Hudhayl al-'Allaf, Ibrahim al-Nazami, and Bishr ibn al-Mu'tamir, along with others who are people

of disbelief and misguidance. Among them were: al-Hasan ibn Abd al-Wahhab al-Jabbani and Abu al-Anbas al-Saymari. From the Raafidah (Shi'a), they include: al-Mughira ibn Sa'id, Abdullah ibn Saba, Hisham al-Footi, Abu al-Krus, Fudayl al-Raqashi, Abu Malik al-Khadrami, and Saleh Quba.

In fact, they are more numerous than can be counted in a book or summarized in a statement. I have mentioned a sample of their leaders to avoid the innovation and to warn those who are ignorant of their presence, their assembly, and their words. One should not listen to their opinions nor engage in discussions based on their books.

Among their deceivers, those who appear to defend innovation in their speech, and those who support it with their words, are Ibn Kullab, Hussein al-Najjar, and Abu Bakr al-Asamm.

Imam Ibn Batta, may Allah have mercy on him, said in his *Al-Ibanah al-Kubra*: *"I mention these opinions from their sects so that my brothers may understand the various forms of misguidance, polytheism, and wicked speech found in the heretical sects of the Jahmiyyah. This is to warn those without knowledge from sitting with them, associating with them, and adopting their ways. They should not listen to any of their statements or ideas."*

So, look, O seeker of truth, at the warning from the Salaf regarding the people of innovation and heresy, and follow their path. As Ibn Mas'ud, may Allah be pleased with him, said: *"Whoever seeks to follow a path should follow those who have passed away, those who were companions of Muhammad, peace be upon him. They were the best of this ummah, with the most sincere hearts, the deepest knowledge, and the least affected by worldly matters. They were chosen by Allah to accompany His Prophet and convey His religion. So imitate their character and ways, for they were upon the straight guidance."* [Sharh al-Sunnah by al-Baghawi]

-

In

ختاما فهذا تقرير حال الحازمي من فتواه في مصر إلى مابعد الفتوى التونسية خلال ثلاث سنين تقريبا :-

فالحازمي لما بلغ سن الرشد وصار مكلفا **قطعا أنه لم يكن يكفر العاذر، فبناء على أصله أنه كان كافرا لأنه كان يعيش بين المسلمين وهذه تعتبر مسألة ظاهرة إذاً فالحجة عليه قائمة .**

ثم لما تحول إلى الحدادية عرف الحق "بناء على أصله" ثم تاب فدخل في الإسلام فأصبح يكفر **العاذر.**

ثم لما كان في مصر وقال مقالته "....تريد أن تقلد من يعذر لا بأس..." **فهنا جوّز الكفر للمصلحة وهذه ردة عن الدين فارتد حينئذ عن دينه لأنه لم يكن مكرها .**

ثم اعتذر بعد ذلك وتاب ودخل في الإسلام مرة ثانية.

ثم لما سئل عن أنه لا يعذر بالجهل في الدخول في الإنتخابات أنكر نسبة ذلك إليه وقال "كان مقصودي في الرد على الفتوى التونسية هو الشرك الأكبر في العبادة ".

فوقع هنا في ناقضين الأول أنه عذر بالجهل وأن العاذر بالجهل عنده مرتد والناقض الثاني أنه لم يكفر بالطاغوت لأنه لم يجعل الدخول الإنتخابات من الشرك في العبادة فيكون والحالة هذه مرتدا.

وهذا هو أخر ما بلغنا عنه فإنه إلى الأن لم يتراجع ويعتذر ويبين كما أعتذر عن التي قبلها فالحازمي إلى الأن يعتبر مرتد عن الدين ، فإنه لما رد على الشيخ المجاهد تركي البنعلي رد عليه وهو مرتد .

وكل هذا من لازم أقواله وإن كنا لا نلزمه بلازمه لأن لازم المذهب ليس بمذهب مالم يلتزمه.

لكن يلزمك أنت يامن تكفر العاذر أن تكفّر شيخكم الحازمي بل يلزمك تكفيره ليس لإعذاره بالجهل فحسب بل لعدم كفره بالطاغوت وجهله بالتوحيد وجعله الشرك توحيدا ، بل تعتبر أنت كافر إن عذرته بالجهل .

conclusion, this is a report on the situation of Al-Hazmi from his fatwa in Egypt to after the Tunisian fatwa over a period of about three years:

- When Al-Hazmi reached the age of maturity and became accountable, it was clear that he did not consider the excuser (of disbelief) to be a disbeliever. Based on his original position, he considered it disbelief because he was living among Muslims, and this is considered a clear issue. Therefore, the argument against him was established.

- Then, when he moved to the Haddadi ideology, he recognized the truth (based on his original stance) and repented, entering Islam. He began to declare those who excuse others (of disbelief) to be disbelievers.
- When he was in Egypt and said, "... if you want to follow the one who excuses, it's fine..." Here, he allowed disbelief for the sake of some benefit, which is an apostasy from the religion. He became an apostate at that point because he was not coerced.
- He then apologized, repented, and entered Islam once again.
- Later, when asked about not excusing ignorance in relation to entering elections, he denied the attribution of this to him and said, "My intention in responding to the Tunisian fatwa was to address major shirk in worship."
- Here, he contradicted himself in two ways: first, he excused by ignorance, and he considers anyone who excuses out of ignorance to be an apostate. The second contradiction is that he did not declare disbelief in the false gods because he did not view entering elections as major shirk in worship. Thus, in this case, he becomes an apostate.
- This is the latest update we have on him. Up until now, he has not retracted or apologized or clarified as he did with previous statements. Therefore, Al-Hazmi is still considered an apostate from the religion. When he responded to Sheikh Turki al-Binali, he responded while being an apostate. He is bound by his words.
- All of this is a necessary consequence of his statements, and although we do not impose his conclusions on him (because the consequence of a belief is not the belief itself), you, the one who declares the excuser to be a disbeliever, are obligated to declare your sheikh Al-Hazmi a disbeliever. You are obligated to declare him a disbeliever not only for excusing others due to ignorance but also for his failure to declare disbelief in the false gods, his ignorance of tawhid (monotheism), and his equating shirk (polytheism) with tawhid. In fact, you would be considered a disbeliever if you excuse him out of ignorance.

-

-

So, O

فيا طلاب الحق من اتباع الحازمية أمثل هذا يؤخذ علم العقيدة والتوحيد منه ؟ بل كيف تطلب العلم عند رجل مرتد؟ بل كيف تصلي خلف رجل مرتد ؟

وأود أن أسأل سؤالا للحازمية العاذرية ، من لا يكفر العاذر هل يعتبر عندكم كافرٌ أصليٌ أم أنه مرتد ؟

لأن كل من لا يكفر العاذر قد نشأ على ذلك لما بلغ الرشد وصار مكلفا وهو بين المسلمين. فنريد جوابا عاجلا لأن أحكام الكافر الأصلي تختلف عن أحكام المرتد .

واعلم يا من تكفر العاذر أنك بالأمس كنت كافرا ثم أسلمت ودخلت في الإسلام لما تبين لك الحق الشيطاني .

وختاما كل ما ذكرت فلا أعني الحازمي بعينه وإنما أعني كل من يعتقد هذا المعتقد ويتبناه ، فاحذر ياطالب الحق من هذا المزلق الخطير فالمسألة عقيدة فلا تساوم عليها .

وأنا أدعو الحازمي إلى التوبة من هذه البدعة النكراء ولا بد أن تبين وتصرح برجوعك إلى الحق ، وصفة التوبة كما قال السفاريني :-

وَتَوْبَةُ الْمُبْتَدِعِ أَنْ يَعْتَرِفَ بِأَنَّ مَا عَلَيْهِ بِدْعَةٌ، قَالَ فِي الشَّرْحِ – أي الشرح الكبير على المقنع -: فَأَمَّا الْبِدْعَةُ:- فَالتَّوْبَةُ مِنْهَا بِالِاعْتِرَافِ بِهَا، وَالرُّجُوعِ عَنْهَا، وَاعْتِقَادِ ضِدِّ مَا كَانَ يَعْتَقِدُ مِنْهَا.

وَفِي الرِّعَايَةِ:- مَنْ كَفَرَ بِبِدْعَةٍ قُبِلَتْ تَوْبَتُهُ عَلَى الْأَصَحِّ، قِيلَ: إنْ اعْتَرَفَ بِهَا، وَإِلَّا فَلَا.

قَالَ الْإِمَامُ أَحْمَدُ فِي رِوَايَةِ الْمَرُّوذِيِّ فِي الرَّجُلِ يُشْهَدُ عَلَيْهِ بِالْبِدْعَةِ فَيَجْحَدُ:- لَيْسَتْ لَهُ تَوْبَةٌ، إنَّمَا التَّوْبَةُ لِمَنْ اعْتَرَفَ فَأَمَّا مَنْ جَحَدَ فَلَا تَوْبَةَ لَهُ.

seekers of truth among the followers of Al-Hazmiyyah, can such a person be trusted to teach knowledge of creed and monotheism? How can you seek knowledge from a man who is an apostate? How can you pray behind an apostate?

I would like to ask a question to the followers of Al-Hazmiyyah who excuse others (for disbelief): Does the one who does not declare the excuser (ignorant) as a disbeliever consider him an original disbeliever or an apostate? Because everyone who does not declare the excuser as a disbeliever has grown up with that belief, having reached maturity and accountability while living among Muslims. So we seek an urgent response, because the rulings for an original disbeliever differ from those of an apostate.

And know, O one who declares the excuser a disbeliever, that yesterday you were a disbeliever, but you converted and entered Islam when the truth was clear to you, as the satanic truth became apparent.

Finally, everything I have mentioned is not meant specifically for Al-Hazmi, but for anyone who believes in and adopts this belief. Beware, O seeker of truth, of this dangerous pitfall, for this is a matter of creed, so do not compromise on it.

I call upon Al-Hazmi to repent from this vile innovation. It is necessary that you clarify and openly declare your return to the truth. The condition for repentance, as stated by Al-Saffarini, is:

"The repentance of an innovator is to confess that what he follows is an innovation." In the explanation (of the great commentary on Al-Muqni'), it is said: "As for innovation, repentance from it involves admitting it, turning away from it, and believing in the opposite of what he previously believed about it."

In Al-Ri'ayah, it is stated: "If a person denies an innovation, his repentance is accepted, according to the most correct view, if he admits it. Otherwise, it is not accepted." Imam Ahmad said, in a narration from Al-Marwazi, regarding a man who is testified against for innovation but denies it: "He has no repentance; repentance is only for the one who confesses. As for the one who denies it, there is no repentance for him."

And I

وأختم كلامي بثلاث وصايا :

الوصية الأولى : لإبن القيم يقول :

وقد جعلتُ أوردُ عليه إيراداً بعد إيراد يأتي الى شيخ الاسلام ويعطيه ايرادات – يعني شبه – أكثر عليه ، قال له : لا تجعل قلبك للإيرادات والشبهات مثل السفنجة ، فيتشربها فلا ينضح إلا بها ولكن اجعله كالزجاجة المصمتة المغلقة ، تمر الشبهات بظاهرها لا وتستقر فيها فيراها بصفائه ويدفعها بصلابته والا فإذا أشربت قلبك كل شبهة تمر عليك صار مقراً للشبهات .

يقول الإمام إبن القيم : " فما أعلم أني انتفعت بوصيةٍ في دفع الشبهات كانتفاعي بهذه الوصية".

الوصية الثانية : لابن الوزير اليماني :

بعد ماقال أن التكفير سمعي محض،لا مدخل للعقل فيه، وذلك من وجهين:.....

قال الوجه الثاني : أن الدليل على الكفر والفسق لا يكون إلا سمعيا قطعيا ، ولا نزاع في ذلك وإنما النزاع في بعض الأدلة على التكفير ، هل هو قاطع أم لا ؟ وأنت إذا عرفت معنى القاطع، عرفت الحق في تلك الأدلة المعينة.

واعلم أن القطع لا بد أن يكون من جهة ثبوت النص الشرعي في نفسه ، ومن جهة وضوح معناه. فأما ثبوته فلا طريق إليه إلا التواتر الضروري،كما تقدم.

وأما وضوح معناه ،فهل يمكن أن يكون قطعيا ولا يكون ضروريا ؟ .....

ألى أن قال.... والقصد التنبيه على أن لفظ الكفر الموضوع في الشرع لمضادة الإسلام ، إذا لم يكن قاطعا في معناه الشرعي ، فكيف بكثير من الاستخراجات البعيدة والاستنباطات المتكلفة ، والإلزامات المتعسفة، والمفهومات المتخيلة ، وقد صح عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال : " إذا قال المسلم لأخيه ياكافر، فقد باء بها أحدهما " **ولا ملجأ للمسلم إلى التعرض لمثل هذا الذنب العظيم ، والخطأ في العفو أولى من الخطأ في العقوبه** .

٣٧

conclude my speech with three pieces of advice:

The first piece of advice: From Ibn al-Qayyim, he says:

"I used to bring various doubts and objections to him, and he would present them to Sheikh al-Islam. He would give him objections—meaning doubts—many times. He told him: 'Do not make your heart like a sponge for doubts and objections, absorbing them so that it only dispels what is absorbed. Instead, make your heart like a sealed bottle, so the doubts pass over it without settling in. With its clarity, it sees them and rejects them firmly. Otherwise, if you allow your heart to absorb every doubt that comes your way, it will become a resting place for doubts.' Ibn al-Qayyim said: 'I do not know of any advice that has benefited me more in repelling doubts than this one.'"

The second piece of advice: From Ibn al-Wazir al-Yamani:

After stating that takfir (declaring someone an unbeliever) is based purely on what is heard, with no role for the intellect in it, he said the second point: "The evidence for disbelief and immorality must be purely based on sound, decisive revelation, and there is no dispute about that. The dispute is about some evidence of takfir—whether it is decisive or not. Once you understand what is meant by decisive evidence, you will know the truth about those particular pieces of evidence.

And know that certainty must come from two sides: the establishment of the scriptural text in itself and the clarity of its meaning. As for its establishment, it can only be through a certain, mass transmission, as mentioned earlier. And as for its clarity, can it be certain without being evident? Until he said: ... The point is to draw attention to the fact that the term 'kufr' (disbelief) in the law has an opposite relationship with Islam. If it is not decisive in its legal meaning, then how about many distant interpretations, forced inferences, burdensome obligations, and imagined concepts? It was authentically reported from the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) that he said: 'If a Muslim says to his brother, 'O kafir,' one of them is deserving of it.' A Muslim should not expose himself to such a great sin. The error in pardoning is preferable to the error in punishment."

الوصية الثالثة لعبدالله ابابطين :

وأيضاً فما تنازع العلماء في كونه كفراً، فالإحتياط للدين التوقف وعدم الإقدام مالم يكن في المسألة نص صريح عن المعصوم ﷺ.

وقد استزل الشيطان أكثر الناس في هذه المسألة، فقصر بطائفه فحكموا بإسلام من دلت نصوص الكتاب والسنه والاجماع ع كفره ، وتعدى بآخرين فكفروا من حكم الكتاب والسنه مع الاجماع بأنه مسلم ..

ووفق الله الجميع.

كتبه العبد الفقير : قدّاح اليماني

-

The third advice is from Abdullah Al Butayn:

"Furthermore, the scholars have not disputed whether it is disbelief. Therefore, the precaution for the religion is to refrain and not to act unless there is a clear text from the infallible (one).

Satan has misled many people in this matter; some were lenient and ruled that those who the texts of the Qur'an, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the scholars indicated as disbelievers were actually Muslims. Others went too far and declared as disbelievers those whom the Qur'an, the Sunnah, and consensus have affirmed as Muslims...

May Allah guide everyone.

Written by the poor servant: Qadah al-Yamani"